

# Journal of Sexology

and

## Psychanalysis

*Edited by*

William J. Robinson, M.D. and S. A. Tannenbaum, M.D.

---

Volume 1.

March, 1923.

No. 2

---

### ARE THERE STRICTLY MONOGAMOUS MEN?

In his book, "Tramping on Life," Harry Kemp tells in his whimsical manner of a lecture which Miss Emma Goldman delivered in the university town where he was a student.

The lecture was on sex, and naturally the hall was jammed to the doors. She spoke against the double standard, but of course she did not demand that men should be as chaste up to their marriage as they want women to be. On the contrary, she demanded that women should be as free in their sexual life as men are. And she expressed her doubt that there was a single man in the audience who had no relations prior to his marriage. Here are the exact words, as reported by Harry Kemp:

"I doubt if there is a solitary man in this audience, a married man, who has not had pre-marital intercourse with women. Yes, I think I can safely say that there is not one married man who can honestly claim that he came to his wife in that same physical purity that he required of her."

There was a professor in the audience. He leaped to his feet in a fury. In deep indignation he shouted, "Here is one," forgetting in his anger the audience, most of whom knew him.

There followed an uproar such as the author never saw before or since. The students howled with joy, Miss Goldman choked with laughter. After the noise subsided, Emma Goldman became serious, and this is what she said:

"I don't know who you are," she called out, "but I'll take chances in telling you that you are a liar."

Of course the boys were in high glee, they hooted and catcalled, and Emma Goldman laughed until the tears streamed down her face.

I am referring to this incident, because it illustrates beautifully the dogmatism of the average human being, which I have occasion to criticize so often. Because Emma Goldman and her male



friends lived a free sexual life and both preached and practiced promiscuity, therefore she could not imagine that there were people who lived a strictly monogamous life.

And yet no fact is more firmly established than this. I have had *hundreds and hundreds* of patients who had no sexual relations whatsoever up to the day of their marriage, who were literally as chaste as their wives. And I have no doubt that in this country there are millions of men who never had relations with any other women except their wives. In fact, in the smaller American towns it is not the exception but rather the rule for men to get married without having had any sex experience. And a strictly monogamous husband is not a rare exception in this country. The case is different in the central European and Latin countries. That the men may have had desires for other women, that they may have hankered for polygamous experiences, may be granted. But we all agree that nobody can be held responsible for his feelings. Feelings and thoughts come unbidden. It is actions that count.

W. J. R.

---

#### DREAM INTERPRETATION RUN MAD

I have read many ridiculous, far-fetched, absurd interpretations of dreams. But I believe that the palm for ridiculousness, far-fetchedness and absurdity in dream interpretations belongs to Dr. Wilhelm Stekel, whose "The Language of the Dream," (translated into English under the more alluring title "Sex and Dreams") I have just finished reading.

It is not a pleasant thing to attack a man, to say plainly that you suspect his *bona fides* both in the dreams and in their interpretation; but it cannot be helped. Humanity's dearest possession is Reason. Its only hope is in Reason. Humanity will not get out from its mire of misery, poverty and hatred until it learns to reason clearly, logically, to judge sanely, and to demand proofs for all statements and beliefs. And I consider a man who befuddles the minds of the people, who increases the darkness in which humanity is groping is a greater enemy than he who robs the people of their money, of the fruits of their labor. Hence my great antagonism toward newspaper editors, militarists, certain species of clerical gentlemen, spiritualists, theosophists, Christian Scientists, chiropractors, Abramites and psychoanalysts.

I believe that some psychoanalysts have done as much damage in upsetting, in muddling up people's minds as any of the gentle-



men of the other categories, and of all the muddlers, Dr. Stekel is the very worst; certainly one of the very worst. His interpretation of dreams is simply outrageous. Without rhyme or reason, he makes assertions for which no excuse can be given for which no scintilla of proof can be offered.

I am strongly tempted to take every one of his dreams in his book, reprint the dream and his interpretation in their entirety and show the utter disingenuousness, the ridiculous, far fetched distortion, nay, the dishonesty of the whole business. But as this would necessitate a book twice as large as Dr. Stekel's, I cannot attempt the task here. I may undertake it some time. Here I will have to limit myself to a few examples.

Let us take Dream 52.—*Charles came, and offered me some cigarettes in a box, but I did not take any as it was forenoon and I had no desire to smoke.*

Evidently a very simple dream; most likely a reproduction of a real event. Austrian ladies do smoke a good many cigarettes, they are often offered cigarettes by their gentleman friends. And many people dislike smoking in the forenoon. But what does Stekel make out of the dream?

According to Stekel, that dream *proves that the woman is a homo-sexual*. Why? Because a cigarette is the symbol of the male sexual organ. And as she refused to take it, it proves that she denies her female tendencies; that she does not want to have anything to do with men; that she is a homosexual.

And so it is in every other dream. Every object dreamed of is made to stand for the genital organs, either male or female, or both. As Stekel says: "In the dream *anything* oblong may represent the penis and *anything* round may stand for the vagina." But as dreams often go by contraries, anything oblong may represent the female and anything round the male. Or *anything whatever* may represent both. According to Stekel *there is not a single dream* that is not a sex dream. On page 49 he says: "It is not possible to give an account of a dream analysis without touching on eroticism. *There is, in fact, no anerotic dream.*"

But not only that; practically every dream is bi-sexual, and has incest fantasies and goes down as far as infancy. We also must remember that "*in every dream the thought of death is also woven in.*" "There is no dream that does not contain an adumbration of death," says Stekel.

Dream 27. A woman patient tells Dr. Stekel the following dream: "*A little, old, ugly woman chases me around the table; I am afraid and wake up with fear.*"



Without any rhyme or reason, without any proof or plausible explanation why, Dr. Stekel tells us that the old, ugly woman stands for a big, attractive young man. Why? Suppose that patient had dreamed that she was pursued by a nice, attractive young man. Would Dr. Stekel have distorted that dream so as to make the young man be symbolic of an ugly, old woman? Oh, no. That would spoil the dream. It would spoil the erotic feature of it.

And so we are in a chaotic condition. Whenever it suits the psychoanalyst he takes the dream as it stands. When it doesn't suit him, he turns it around, changes it about, chops off a piece here, adds another piece there. In short, he does with the dream whatever he pleases, and then dares to tell us that the dream is of deep significance and represents the true inner character of the dreamer.

The patient says further, that the old woman in the dream tears off her blouse and wants to stick her hand between the breasts. "This," says Dr. Stekel, "would be a procedure wholly illogical on the part of an old woman but perfectly intelligible on the part of a young man in the same situation, which really pictures a rape phantasy." But this is not enough. As dreams mean the opposite of what they are, *being pursued* may really mean *pursuing*, and therefore the dream may also mean that "she struggles with a wish to run after a big man." But why should she want to tear open the man's waistcoat? "Here," Stekel tells us, "we learn another dream process, the so-called *transposition from below*. In many dreams what takes place below is represented above and reversely. That is an extraordinarily common form of dream distortion. . . . Applying the principle of transposition from below above we arrive at the wish to act aggressively and tear apart a man's trousers."

If you think that that is enough you are mistaken. That dream also signifies that she fears her mother. But, if the little, old, ugly woman stands for her mother, why was it necessary to bring in the big, attractive, young man? But you might as well expect logic and commonsense in Stekel as in a lunatic in a padded cell. Yes, the little, old, ugly woman stands also for the patient's mother. "She fears the mother. She has homosexual leanings and *wishes the assault* which, moreover, signifies a question about her motherhood. For the woman is sterile. She will never have milk in her breast. And now we arrive at the most significant meaning. She wishes to be again with the mother and lie at the nurse's breast. The grip on the breasts is the first pleasurable contact of infancy.



The dream thus plays upon various motives. More than that. *The old woman who seizes her at the heart is the symbol of death. An ancient symbol. Every fear is also a fear of death. In fact, in roundabout ways,—always the fear of death!*"

And all this because a patient whose stomach may have been out of order happened to dream that she was chased by a woman around the table!

Havelock Ellis tells us to beware of too complete, too well-rounded dreams. Many of Stekel's dreams are of that character. And I cannot help being suspicious of them.

The Assembly Dream (No. 22) is one of such dreams. It is too long to be reproduced here in its entirety. I'll do it some other time. I'll reproduce here only a part of it.

*Great uproar in the Assembly House. The Emperor is also present. Thousands of people below, awaiting the Emperor's departure. It is evening and the Assembly House square is illuminated fairy-like for the occasion. Three figures stand watch in front of the main entrance. In the middle stands a gigantic figure dressed as the iron man, a blinding white light emanating from him. At the right and at the left each a figure similarly clad in golden attire. These two are very quiet, almost motionless, but the iron man is nervous.*

Here is Dr. Stekel's interpretation. The Assembly House stands for the mother as well as for the bride. (Why?) It signifies the beloved mother, or the beloved, who shall be the mother of his children. (Why? Where is the proof?) The mother receives the father (Emperor)—naturally evening. The mass of people signify the rebellious wishes, the numberless evil thoughts (evil thoughts, why?) and for that reason, naturally (!) by way of contrast, a secret. The three figures on guard symbolize, like most trinities, the penis and pair of testicles. Here the penis is the "iron man" with the lance; the testicles (egg-yellow) are characterized by golden garments. One on the right, the other on the left. It is an old dream symbolism that the father means also the generating one, that is, the penis." And so on, and so on.

Utterly disgusting, utterly nauseating. And not disgusting and nauseating because it deals with erotic subjects, but because it is false, it is forced, it is distorted, because deliberate attempts are made to give the most innocent dream a sexual turn, and not even a normal heterosexual turn, but a homosexual, bi-sexual, incestuous or scatologic, scatophagic or necrophiliac meaning.

I do not know whether Dr. Stekel is sexually normal or a pervert. But he certainly has homosexuality, incestuous algolagnia



and all sorts of perversions on the brain. I cannot believe that Vienna, even in pre-war times, harbored so many neurotic perverts and that they all came to Stekel to be treated.

So much for the present. I may return to the subject at some future date. I believe it is the duty of honest and clear-seeing men to do what in their power lies to save the people from false teachers, perverts and fakirs.

W. J. R.

---

## SEXUAL IMPOTENCE AND MENTAL DECAY:

### The Confession of a Man of Seventy

We hear and read a good deal about the gloom and despair which overtake men of various ages, who find themselves completely impotent. There is no exaggeration in that. Some men when they make the discovery that they are impotent—be it lack of libido or lack of *potentia erigendi*—feel as if they have nothing to live for, as if everything had come to an end. They run frantically from physician to quack and from quack to physician, they read eagerly all the literature on impotence that they can get a hold of, and then buy hopefully or despairingly every remedy or apparatus advertised as a cure for impotence. If they fail to be relieved or cured, they, that is some of them, fall into a state of melancholia, and there is ground for the belief that impotence is not a negligible factor in a certain percentage of suicides. That it is an important factor in suicides of the newlyweds, *that we know*, but it plays a rôle even in the voluntary demise of the aged and middle-aged. All this is true, but as each human being is in certain respects a law unto himself, as I never tire of repeating, so there is another side to this picture, and I am glad, particularly glad, to be able to report a case illustrating this other side. Here is the case.

Mr. A. A well preserved, spry, ruddy-cheeked man of seventy. I would not have given him more than sixty-five, but he was seventy. To be exact, seventy and a half. When in reply to my question he told me that his complaint, if complaint it was, was impotence, complete impotence, the thought passed through my mind: "Here is another man who does not know when he has had enough, who won't leave well enough alone." But, thank the Lord, he did not want any treatment for his impotence. He wanted to know, and that was all he came for, if it was true as he had read somewhere, that sexual impotence was always accompanied or soon followed by a decay of the mental powers,



of the activity of the brain, of creative ability. I told him that it was distinctly untrue; that one was independent of the other; that, on the contrary, sexual impotence was sometimes followed by an increase in the mental power, and in the capacity for mental (as well as for physical) work. Where sexual impotence and mental decay appeared simultaneously they were both the result of the same underlying cause and the latter was the result of the former. He listened with attentive serenity, and when I finished he said: I thought so, but I wanted to have my opinion corroborated by you.

And then he told me his history.

He had been endowed by nature—blessed or cursed, the way you look at it—with an exceptionally powerful sexuality. His libido manifested itself quite urgently at the age of eleven or twelve, and from the age of fourteen he was indulging in regular sexual relations. He was married at the age of twenty-six, and for five or six years he lived in strict monogamy. After that indulged regularly and frequently in extra-marital relations. Always in fine health; never any venereal infection; a week without sexual relations would make him restless and irritable and unfit for sustained work. At the age of about fifty-two or three his sexual power began gradually to decline; erections were becoming feebler, and the ejaculations premature; the libido however remained undiminished; if anything, it was increased, due probably to less frequent indulgences and to some prostatic irritation. It went on this way, more or less, for about fourteen or fifteen years; now and then under treatment there would be a temporary improvement of his *potentia erigendi*; but it would not last long. Towards the end he had to give up his amours for good, because on several occasions he felt horribly humiliated, being unable to have the slightest erection. Then he noticed a certain aversion on the part of the females, who he perceived, were giving themselves to him exclusively for the money. In former years, it was not exclusively for that. There was some feeling on their part too. But his libido kept up, though now in a diminished measure. About three years ago, his libido became completely dead, as extinguished as a blown out candle. And it was from that moment that the happiest time of his old age commenced. And it is here also that the interesting point of the story starts, the point that makes the case worth reporting. As long as his *potentia* was on a par with his libido he felt all right, of course. But as he got older, and his *potentia* diminished, he began to despise himself for not being able to overcome or to resist his libido. The interim between say fifty-five and sixty-seven was



a very unpleasant one for him. "I could not see a pretty girl pass without a longing, without a lustful feeling. In theatre, whether witnessing a serious drama, a comedy or a musical show, I would suffer very much indeed; my imagination would keep on working, presenting various positions, etc. A pretty woman could not enter my office or my home without my wanting her passionately. And it cost me great efforts to keep from making a fool of myself. Now it is all over. I can enjoy a show, a musical comedy, even Ziegfeld's Follies as much as I ever did without being disturbed and annoyed by unpleasant physical and psychic feelings, and I can sit near the prettiest young girl with perfect indifference, as if she belonged to the male sex. And my whole life runs more smoothly, more evenly. My general health is improved; I eat better and I sleep much better. And as far as work is concerned, I certainly can accomplish much more than I did ten and fifteen years ago."

The man is at the head of a very large organization and is doing considerable original work. He expressed his pleasure at having had the opportunity to discuss the matter with me, and left.

I report this case—with Mr. A's cheerful permission—because I am anxious to counteract, at every possible opportunity, the vicious notion fostered by quacks and by some, not quite unselfish, physicians, that impotence is invariably followed by mental decay. There are many old people who treat themselves for impotence on account of the impotence itself. That is all right; they have a perfect right to. A man has a right to preserve his sexual potency as long as possible. But many old men are quite satisfied with their impotence. They would not think of going to the expense and trouble of being treated, if they did not fear that their brain would soon follow their sexual power, that they would soon become feeble-minded or soft-brained.

It is to save such people from needless anxiety, needless bother and expense that such cases need be reported, and that we must emphasize the fact that mentality and sexuality are independent of each other. Just as many, many women improve wonderfully both in their body and in their psyche after the complete closure of their sex life, after the passing of all the stages of the menopause, so many men show a new lease of life after their climacterium. This fact should be impressed on the minds of both the laity and the medical profession.

W. J. R.



(For The Journal of Sexology and Psychanalysis)

## SEXUAL CONTINENCE AND ITS INFLUENCE ON THE PHYSICAL AND MENTAL HEALTH OF MEN AND WOMEN

By WILLIAM J. ROBINSON, M. D., New York

A great deal of physical suffering and mental misery would be removed if a general agreement could be reached as to the harmlessness or injuriousness of sexual continence. If the medical profession, the physiologists and the psychologists should arrive at a decision, unanimously, that sexual continence is perfectly harmless or even beneficial, the problems of parents, educators and municipal officials would be greatly simplified. Children would be brought up accordingly; sex relations, except for propagation purposes, would be frowned upon; illicit relations would be condemned much more severely even than they are now, for the satisfaction of sex urge would not be considered a physical or psychic necessity; it would be looked upon as the indulgence of a vicious appetite; those guilty of it would be ostracised and punished as offenders or criminals; the obstacles that would be put in the way of illicit relations would be much greater than they are now, while those catering regularly or temporarily, to the illicit satisfaction of the sexual instinct would be punished with long terms of imprisonment.

That a certain leniency still prevails with regards to the sexual sinner, particularly (or let us say exclusively) of the male sex, is due to the fact that a good many people still believe—openly or secretly—in the so-called sexual necessity.

If, on the other hand, a thorough, unbiased, scientifically conducted investigation should result in a unanimously arrived-at conclusion that sexual continence is injurious to people's health, physical or mental or both, our conduct would differ correspondingly. We would marry off our boys and girls at an early age, and in cases of involuntary bachelorhood, we would not frown upon illicitness, we would not prosecute, hound and ostracize our daughters of sorrow, misnamed daughters of joy, but would look upon them as the Greeks looked upon and treated their hetairae and courtesans, and would facilitate ante-marital relations, instead of rendering them practically impossible, taking only scrupulous care to prevent venereal infection.

We are far off from such a unanimous decision as to either the harmlessness or injuriousness of sexual continence. The reasons are not far to seek. Briefly stated they are as follows:

1. The vast majority of people *rationalize* their feelings. When they think they think they do not think at all; they feel, and their feelings determine their thinking. What they consider logical



and unbiased thinking, is merely a projection of, an excuse for their emotions. The middle-aged or old man, whose sex urge is on the decline or entirely extinguished, will be very apt to consider all sex relations of little or no importance, except for the purpose of race perpetuation; he will be eager or willing to subscribe to the belief that there is no such thing as "sexual necessity" and there will be no difficulty in getting his support for any laws which will make illicit relations punishable offences and difficult or impossible of accomplishment. And it is not even necessary that they should have forgotten that they were young once and that warm blood once coursed in their veins. No, this is not necessary. Because in our thinking *we are not influenced by our past, but by our present feelings*. In a stifling heat we cannot possibly reproduce in our memory the inconveniences we suffered when we were shivering from cold; and when we are becoming paralyzed from an intensely low temperature, we cannot possibly imagine that the burning rays of the sun in a tropical desert may be disagreeable. The man who ceased to care cannot warm up his love by memories of how he had once loved, and the man insanely in love cannot believe that his feelings may sometime change. It is what we feel *now* that has the mastery over us.

And the young man or the man in his prime, with a normal or a supernormal sexuality, not only believes in the "sexual necessity," but is apt to favor polygamy or promiscuity, is in favor of a red district, considers all restrictions unnecessary, and is likely to regard them as the result of puritanical hypocrisy, of a perverted morality.

In brief the sexually weak or the sexless is, in the matter of sexual continence, biased in one direction, the healthily sexed or supersexed is apt to be biased in the opposite direction.

The writer himself cannot be *absolutely* sure that he is *absolutely* unbiased. All he can say is that he tries to be unbiased. Perhaps the fact that he *tries* to exclude his own feelings entirely, basing his opinion exclusively—or as exclusively as he can—on the statements of his patients, thus eliminating as far as possible the personal equation, may lend some weight to his conclusions.

2. Religious and Moral bias. The question of sexual continence is the *only* physical or hygienic question which is mixed up with religious and moral injunctions. As but very few people can completely free themselves from the influence of their bringing up, there are but few people who can discuss the purely physical or psychologic phases of continence without theologic or moralistic bias. Not until the question of continence can be discussed with



the same objectivity, with the same detachment as are, say, questions of fasting or of sleeping with open or closed windows, will we arrive at honest, worth-while conclusions.

3, The Attempt to Put all Humanity in one Mould. I expressed elsewhere my opinion that much of our suffering is due to the attempt to put all mankind on one Procrustean bed, to jam everybody into the same mould, to judge everybody by the same standard. It would be foolish to force everybody to partake of the same diet qualitatively and quantitatively; it is far more absurd to expect everybody to live according to the same standard sexually, because in no other physical condition do people vary so widely as they do in the sexual sphere.

There is not a medical sexologist who has not seen cases of most remarkable differences in libido and potency. In his "Sexual Impotence," the writer has presented such examples. Case one is that of a man of eighty-seven; his wife—she is his third—is forty; they are having sexual relations nightly, and she expresses herself as highly satisfied and happy. He is not only strongly potent and libidinous, but also strongly fertile, so that unless she takes preceptive measures she is almost sure to conceive each time. Case two is that of a man of forty-five. He married at the age of thirty-two. Up to that time he had had no sexual relations, nor had he masturbated. He lived with his wife for eight years, when she died. During these eight years he had relations not oftener than four or five times a year, on the average. Since her death, five years ago, he has had no relations whatever, no night emissions, and he had not been bothered at all by any libidinous desires. Would you prescribe the same sexual norm for both, and would sexual continence have the same results in the first case as it would in the second? To ask the question is to answer it.

I do not wish to be understood as saying that the moral question does not enter into the discussion of the sex question. But I do say that the two questions—the moral and the hygienic—are two separate questions and should be kept separate; and when we discuss the physical and mental harmlessness or injuriousness of continence, the morality, the ethics of sex relations, should not be permitted to confuse the issue. And one other thing. Because one reaches the conclusion that continence is, as a general thing, injurious it does not follow that one approves of or advises extramarital relations. He may consider continence injurious, but he may consider extramarital relations so sinful, as to prefer the physical injury to the sin of illicit relations. On the other



hand, I know a radical who does not believe in the injuriousness of continence, but neither does he believe in the sinfulness of extramarital relations, and he advises and encourages the latter, in spite of his conviction that abstinence is not in the least harmful. He does not see why a pleasureable act should not be indulged in.

If I am asked, as I often am asked in discussing the question of continence, what my opinion is of the morality of extramarital relations, my answer is: It is not a legitimate question. I deliberately refuse to answer, because I do not wish to confuse the issue. In a discussion of *sex morality*, I do not hesitate to state my opinion unequivocally. But I insist that the moral and the hygienic questions be kept apart.

And so, with as much objectivity as is humanly possible and keeping the physical and moral phases of the question strictly separated, I shall endeavor to answer the question: Is sexual continence harmless or injurious to human beings?

## CHAPTER II.

Less than forty-eight hours ago I saw a woman, thirty-six years of age. She is insane, and from morning to night her incessant talk is filled with sexual subjects, with the most offensive kind of obscenity. And those who know her history, know her passionate nature, are convinced that lack of sexual outlet was in her case responsible for her pitiful condition. If we should take this case as an example, we would say: Decidedly, sexual continence is injurious.

I met a priest, sixty-three years old, who had never had sex relations, and who is in the finest health. Robust, cheerful, excellent appetite, sound sleep, never a headache, and full of vim and energy. If we should take this good priest for an example, we would have to say: No, sexual continence is not in the least injurious. On the contrary, it seems to be beneficial.

But a sexologist who sees a great number of cases, sees various degrees of continence and their widely varying results, does not draw conclusions from one or two cases. He calls upon his entire experience to help him out. And even then he is not dogmatic, but makes his statements tentatively.

But before making any statements, dogmatic or tentative, I wish to deal with a few mis-statements, underestimates and false analogies of which some of our indiscriminate continence advocates are guilty. I am not accusing them of deliberate misrepresentation; quite the contrary, I am now convinced that most of



the continence advocates are sincere; in some cases their zeal may be the result of a defence mechanism, but unconscious bias is not hypocrisy.

The first point I shall touch upon is the frequently encountered comparison of the sex urge to an artificially acquired habit—to alcoholism or morphinism. This is of course absurd. A person becomes addicted to alcohol or morphine only after he has partaken of those drugs a number of times; he becomes used to the sensations and desires to repeat them, or his body develops an irresistible craving for them. Quite the contrary is true of the sex urge. The sex urge is present before the boy or man has had any sexual experience; the longer the abstinence lasts the stronger the urge; while after a number of experiences have been had, the urge instead of increasing in intensity, as is the case with habit-forming drugs, diminishes decidedly, until it becomes very moderate indeed.

Another point frequently met with in the speeches and writings of our continence advocates is the putting of the sex urge and of its normal satisfaction on a par with anti-social acts: with arson, theft, burglary, and—yes, some even go so far—with murder. This is really too childish to deserve serious discussion. Mankind as a whole is not born with powerful, unconquerable urges to burn, burglarize and kill; man is, however, born with a very strong sex instinct. If this was a mistake on the part of nature, nature should be made to bear at least a part of the responsibility. Man who is merely the innocent hereditary product of ten million generations should not be made to carry all the blame on his weak shoulders.

A third misstatement which frequently occurs in the writing of continence advocates is that the sexual desire is excited only by external stimuli: by the sight of our painted, rouged and semi-dressed women, by obscene theatrical posters, by lewd musical shows, by erotic pictures, and so forth. To this statement I have two objections. First, how can we save our young men from all external stimuli? Shall we keep them permanently in cellars, or shall we lock them in trunks? I have had, for instance, *dozens* of patients who twice daily underwent strong sexual excitement from riding in the subway. They had no sex relations and being closely pressed against women would throw them in a sexual turmoil which would result in an ejaculation, or would necessitate masturbation. Another patient would be greatly excited by the marble statues in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Still another would become powerfully tumescent at the sight of lingerie and



corsets, and the female figures in the shop windows; and it is not only musical shows, but the purest comedies and dramas in which the heroine is young and pretty—and she is supposed to be so invariably—have a greatly irritating and sexually stimulating influence on many continent young men. And the lyric song of a primadonna has set many a man on fire. About our rotten movies, with their frequent attempts at rape, the less said the better. Even the advertisements of hosiery, underwear and corsets in a magazine act very titillatingly on some men who live a celibate life. How are you going to save them from all those external influences? Only by making them totally deaf and blind.

But—and this is my second objection—I deny the truth of the statetment. I affirm that if people were brought up in complete isolation, without ever seeing a woman or a picture of a woman, without learning anything about the two sexes, without ever hearing a smutty story or an obscene joke, they would still have the sex urge, and probably of the same intensity. It might awake a little later, it might not manifest itself quite so frequently, but it would be there just the same; and if it would awaken later, it might come to the surface with so much greater intensity. No, external stimuli simply act like sparks on powder, but the powder is there; and powder can detonate by mere percussion without the aid of a spark; the sex hormones act like sparks, and the libido is spontaneously inflammable.

A fourth point I wish to touch upon is the minimizing, so usual with our continence advocates, of the force and the urgency of the sex instinct. It is all well meant. I have no doubt about that. The idea is that if you tell a young man that the thing is not of much importance, that with a little effort it is easy to overcome it, the *suggestion* will have its effect, and the young man will find it easier to overcome it. And in a certain number of cases it works. But, alas, in some other cases it has an effect contrary to the one desired. When a young man who suffers torments finally takes up courage to tell his trouble to his priest or doctor, and he is told “just forget it,” or is advised to take a glass of cold water or to stand on the cold floor with his bare feet or to take a brisk walk, and he finds after following the advice faithfully, that he cannot “just forget it,” and that the cold water, the cold floor and the brisk walk have very little effect in quenching his libido and in allaying his tumescence, he reaches the conclusion that his advisers are boobs or liars, or that he is an exceptional case. And he then eagerly accepts the invitation of a sophisticated friend to intro-



duce him to some nice girl friend or to a house which in former years had a red light or red curtains.

Sensible and sober people have with their eyes open and with full knowledge of the possible dangers run the risk of venereal infection; sane and otherwise well-balanced people have run the risk of social ostracism, of public disgrace, and of economic ruin; kind-hearted people have jeopardized the honor and peace of mind of their parents, of beloved members of their families; and some men have even risked thrones and empires—all to satisfy the imperious and sometimes truly irresistible sex urge. Such an instinct cannot well be considered a negligible thing which can be fooled with a glass of cold water or by standing with the bare feet on a cold floor. As to exercise, I have shown elsewhere that it *often* has the effect contrary to the one desired. Either, by stimulating the circulation, it increases the libido; or by exhausting the body and weakening the will-power it renders the young man an easier victim to masturbation.

Let us not follow the sex-obsessed, and let us not magnify the importance of the sex instinct as if it were the only pivot around which humanity turns; but, on the other hand, let us not minimize the rôle it plays in human affairs. For individual human weal or woe it is certainly the most important of all factors.

I really believe in telling the truth. In the vast majority of cases and in the long run, we accomplish more by telling the truth as we see it, without minimizing or magnifying. In discussing the sex instinct it is best not to try to minimize its importance, its force, its urge; and it is not even well to magnify the dangers of venereal infection. If we succeed in convincing our patients or our wards that we are on the square with them, that we are not trying to put something over on them, that we are not lying to them in order to make them good, we have accomplished a great deal, and they will follow our advice and our injunctions unquestioningly. If not unquestioningly, at least much more readily. I know I have much less difficulty in making my patients abstain six months or a year, if I find it necessary, than do those doctor-theologians who get into an hysterical fit when the subject of so-called illicit relations is mentioned. The truth is a pretty good thing and a pretty reliable guide, after all.

[The concluding chapters of this essay, containing case reports and "conclusions," will appear in the next issue.]



(For The Journal of Sexology and Psychoanalysis)

## ORGANOTHERAPY IN SEXUAL IMPOTENCE

By VICTOR G. VECKI, M. D., San Francisco, Calif.

*Read before the San Francisco County Medical Society,  
October 31, 1922*

Organotherapy is having a hard time, being buffeted, almost ground to pieces between ignorant quacks and high ultra-conservative authorities. We know that the quack is, was and always will be on hand to foist himself upon any new discovery in the healing art. The quack may mulct the gullible among the poor and the rich, throw some discredit upon the subject in question, discourage the timid, and to some extent hamper progress, but we can and must ignore him, because we cannot afford to waste our time.

Looking at the problem from a selfish standpoint, surely it would have been better if the medical profession had never undertaken to denounce and to fight the various cults and "isms," for hardly is one of them down and out than two new ones spring up.

Many years ago I practiced in a city where the poundkeeper started to quack. He seemed to be getting quite popular, and at a meeting of the local medical society the question was brought up if he should be stopped, but the motion was lost after I stated that everyone ought to know what kind of a physician he should have, and, if there are people who think that the poundkeeper is the man for them, they really ought to have him. And today one might argue that if a part of the people wish to be treated by uneducated followers of some impossible stupid system, let them. The medical profession surely will not be damaged as long as it keeps its own ranks clean and fit.

Conservatism surely is more than needed in medicine. Whoever has witnessed, or knows by tradition, the many disappointments that followed some apparently great discoveries, some brilliant ideas, will be only too glad to see that our own "Jupiter tonans," supported by the mighty demigods and big bosses of American Medical Science is, so to speak, from Missouri, and wants to be properly shown before putting the stamp of approval on anything new and out of the ordinary. Almost invariably the judgment is right, but once in a great while something seems to be wrong, and sometimes there is shown too much severity for some Prometheus who is too stubbornly fighting for what he thinks is right.

Endocrinology, we are told, is all right, but organotherapy is very seldom right, and if there were any possibility to enforce the eventual ruling, it would be to limit organotherapy to the well-established indications of cretinism, Graves' disease, acromegaly,



dystrophia adiposo-genitalis. Addison's disease; it would be sometimes permitted in obstetrics, in shock and perhaps a few other emergencies. But it is too late, the lion has tasted blood; the physicians of the country, at first incredulous, then timid, have seen too much; organotherapy has come to stay, no matter what any one says. *Facta loquuntur*, and the medical rank and file will surely not wait patiently "until we know more about the content of the organ extracts, and the etiology of the maladies we are trying to cure by them." How would it have been to wait with the use of quinine until we knew something about the etiology of malaria?

We are told that "clinical evidence is not always absolutely true," but we know that nothing is absolutely true, and when we see that the "post hoc" happens regularly, no one can blame us when we take it for the "propter hoc." We must agree with Llewellys F. Barker when he claims that "accurate clinical observations are just as truly facts as are physiologic or histologic observations."

No one could accuse me of lack of cautious conservatism. In 1901 when the third edition of my "Pathology and Therapy of Sexual Impotence" appeared, I said: "In conclusion we must speak of Organotherapy, which, though still in its inceptive stadium, promises great results." At that time I was only able to report, on the basis of my experience since 1890, on the benefits derived from the use of Brown-Séquard's testicular emulsion and about the doubtful value of Von Poehl's spermine. I came to the conclusion that: "On the whole, a trial may be ventured, and further experiments are advisable."

When the fourth edition of the same book was published in 1912, I thought it justifiable to add that: "An enormous field of possibilities opens before us with the study of the internal secretions of various glands. While it seems to me that I have obtained some remarkable results with the internal and hypodermic administration of various glandular extracts, I am not ready to go further than to state that thyroidin, adrenalin and pituitary extracts perform in proper cases small miracles, that further experiments are imperative, but that a careless use must be waned against, because damage is easily done."

Even in 1915 when the fifth edition of my "Sexual Impotence" was published, I was not ready to go much further, absolutely agreeing with Howell who said at that time that "biological investigation along these lines is largely in the morphological stage."

And though it is true that even now when asked: What do we



know about endocrinology? we must acknowledge that it is morphological facts only; we also know the phenomena that take place after extirpation, and we know the phenomena following grafting, injecting and feeding of glands and glandular preparations.

Sure of what I had seen so often in thirty years of actual organotherapy experience, the sixth edition of my book, mentioned before, was written in 1920 under the sway of endocrinology, and almost every one of its sections came under the influence of the increased knowledge of the functions of the glands of internal secretion.

No one can depend entirely upon his own experience, but if I compare the actual results obtained in thousands of cases, with the reports of others, even the greatest of the bosses must excuse my enthusiasm, and the most renowned physiologist must not condemn me when my organotherapy runs away ahead of his "irrefutably established" endocrinologic facts. I am glad to be in pretty good company.

Whoever wishes to sit down and wait until everything is clear, may do so; I know that many of my patients have been benefitted by my aggressiveness, and that no damage has been done thereby. But, it can never be emphasized enough that the exact study of endocrinology is absolutely necessary for anyone who wishes to use organotherapy, and that haphazard methods can bring no results, and may do some damage. Barker properly warns against reckless, ill-planned, fumbling attempts at what he terms incretory therapy. In most cases it is no mean task, and frequently even impossible, "to disentangle in a given person the complex, interacting determination factors and conditioning factors that account for a given endocrinopathy."

Leopold Levi advises to start with the giving of one gland, the one that seems to be most indicated, and then to add subsequently increasing doses of other glands according to the most apparent indications. We must never forget, however, as Biedel of Prague picturesquely expresses it, that the endocrine system has a democratic constitution, there are no rulers and no subjects, each member is directing and directed at the same time. One for all and all for one in order to maintain and secure the endocrine equilibrium.

When treating sexual impotence one is fortunately in a better position to know what is best to use, than when dealing with other dysfunctions, but nevertheless things are never as simple as



some authors seem to think. Again we must insist that a thorough knowledge of the patient's bodily condition, of his personal and family history are necessary and that all possible foci of infection must be eliminated before ordering anything, and every patient must be under strict observation while using any organic preparation.

While, as Arthur Weis of Chicago expresses it, our knowledge concerning endocrinology in its various aspects still represents only the fringe of a vast unexplored continent, we are in possession of a sufficient amount of facts to be more than justified in employing organotherapy in many cases of hypogonadism. Purposely I am not speaking of hypergonadism, because, disregarding vainglorious boasting, it is a rare condition, and the so-called sufferers seldom consult a physician.

Lipschuetz accentuates that the study of internal secretion, called endocrinology, is but another designation for bio-chemistry, or, as I would say, is a part of bio-chemistry, part of the study of chemic forces at work in living organisms. And I can see clearly that my old teacher in physiology, Bruecke, spoke prophetic words in 1876 when he said that the future of medicine lies in chemistry.

So far we must be modest and still be satisfied with a little when we come to the consideration of all the well-established facts in regard to the various glands of internal secretion.

There can be no doubt of the role of heredity, and while we formerly blamed "nervous heredity" we now frequently must speak of "glandular heredity."

I always knew that Hoffmann, my old teacher of legal medicine, was correct when claiming, in 1881, that "it is a fact that there are men who from their birth either lack the incitomotor impulse which dominates over the sexual functions, especially erectility, or in whom it appears abnormally impaired," but now one can readily understand the cause of the "lack of incitomotor impulse." We can understand now why some people can stand anything, and why others break down at the least cause. Any kind of a dystrophy may become aggravated and therefore obvious by an infectious disease, most frequently by syphilis; by some kind of a trauma and even by some great emotion. In many cases, the process of puberty furnishes the causal factor for an intensifying of the inherited glandular shortcoming.

Taking the glands of internal secretion one by one we must state that, so far, we know very little about *the pineal gland*, but the little that we do know is very interesting and fascinating.

We know that very good results were obtained in growing cats and in children with retarded development. Some reported good



results from its administration in senility, but too little is really known to permit of any definite recommendations.

Considerably more is known of *the pituitary gland* or hypophysis cerebri. There can be no doubt about its relation to the sexual glands and its influence upon the development and functional ability of the reproductive organs. Pituitary-infantile cases are always also genital-infantile cases. Even an accidental injury to the testicles, resulting in atrophy, frequently causes hypo-pituitarism. I have found that the best results are obtained from preparations of the whole gland, (one-fourth to one grain). We know too little of the various extracts obtained from the gland, therefore personally I have never used hypophysine, nor tethelin, though Goetsch obtained good results, like increase in weight, accelerated growth and marked development of the sexual organs. Surely we may draw some conclusions from the well known effect of pituitary preparations upon the uterus, as we know that there is a part in man that corresponds to the uterus. At the same time, we know the pituitary preparations do increase peristalsis.

The diagnosis of hypopituitarism is obvious, a look at the face-formation may almost suffice, and permits conclusions as to the development and functional capacity of the sexual organs; conclusions that are often confirmed by local inspection. Many a patient is surprised to find that his history is written upon his face. A child suffering with dyscrinism can easily be distinguished in any crowd, but the looks and the shape of a decidedly hypopituitary child are so glaringly obvious that one can only wonder why parents, and more so why physicians, pay so little attention to the condition. Of course, if anyone thinks that the sexual instincts ought to be sublimated, then conditions like dystrophia adipose-genitalis may be very desirable. In any case of hypopituitarism, the hope of restoring nearly normal conditions are brighter if treatment is started before the puberty period of life. The earlier the better.

Preparations obtained from the posterior lobe of the pituitary gland are, however, contraindicated wherever we have to deal with high blood-pressure.

The most thoroughly investigated gland is *the thyroid*. We know that "the thyroid cells form an internal secretion containing a specific hormone which acts as a chemical stimulus to other tissues, causing an augmentation of their metabolism." Howell qualifies this statement by saying, "It is usually assumed." Experience, however, teaches that it really is. We know that the thyroid is closely associated with the sexual glands. Its removal



or atrophy retards the development of the sexual organs, and causes sexual infantilism.

The influence of the thyroid upon all endocrine glands is unmistakable, and there is no doubt that even exocrine glands like the liver and pancreas are influenced by thyroid. One of my patients promptly develops glycosuria whenever fed on even small doses of thyroid. In fact, I have learned that thyroid is the only gland preparation that is, in a large number of cases, effective when given alone. Mainly in obese patients, who have no evident dysfunction of other glands, most satisfactory and sometimes brilliant results are obtained by feeding thyroid alone. Of course, one must be careful. The individual dose required must be found out. This is easily done when starting with a single small dose, about one-twelfth grain given at bed-time, cautiously increasing to even one grain three times a day if well tolerated and necessary. The patient is to be closely watched, temperature, pulse, blood-pressure and basal metabolism must be observed, and one should not wait for symptoms of hyperthyroidism, untoward effects like headache, palpitations, shortness of breath, restlessness and sleeplessness. The treatment should be discontinued every month for one week or less, and the patient's condition and feelings compared during rest and treatment. Needless to say that, as in all other phases of organotherapy, the patient's judgment alone can never be the criterion by which to go.

I have no experience with any preparations of those highly important though minimal glands, *the para-thyroids*. We know what happens when they are removed. I have never used *the thymus*. It is being recommended for many conditions, probably because it does no harm, and mainly on account of its richness in phosphorus substances and nucleo-proteids. I thought to have made the observation that, what Howell proposes to name hyperthymism, is not compatible with sexual vigor. So far radiographic findings seem to confirm my suspicions. These, however, are not quite reliable.

We know that castration causes hypertrophy of the thymus, that extirpation of the thymus hampers the development of the skeleton, but hastens puberty. So far I can only see reasons why thymus preparations should not be used in the treatment of sexual impotence. Of course, some one may object that castration also causes an increase in volume and weight of the pituitary body, but the question of the thymus is one instance where it surely is advisable to wait for further information.

Though adrenalin and epinephrin have been used extensively for a number of years, our knowledge about the *adrenal glands* is



incomplete. We know that there is an interrelation of activities between the adrenals and the thyroid, mutually supporting and stimulating each other. Personal experience has taught me to be very careful with the use of adrenal preparations in old people, and in all cases complicated with arteriosclerosis, high blood-pressure and diabetes. The average dose is one-half to two grains, though I must agree with Lisser when he claims that "we have no adequate ideas of dosage." I am, however, of the opinion that besides intestinal cramps and diarrhoea we have a warning signal of an eventual overdose in the appearance of sugar in the urine.

Any patient using any adrenal preparation must be watched most carefully; the urine should be examined frequently, because glycosuria and albuminuria may be caused by a careless feeding of adrenal gland preparations. And then we are told that it has no effect when ingested, as if in the digestion all beneficiary effects are destroyed, and only the baneful ones assimilated. Two and two will always be four, and evident facts will always be more convincing than any apparently scientific deductions.

No gland was so much interfered with, so much treated, often maltreated and so frequently operated upon and removed, as *the prostate*. Its tremendous influence upon the individual's well- and ill-being and feeling is at present fully appreciated. When a person cannot empty the bladder the prostate is at once a urinary organ, when he is impotent it is a genital one, when the individual suffers with arthritic troubles the prostate becomes a focus, and still we know so little about its internal secretory activities and its relation to other endocrine organs.

Unfortunately most surgeons have paid too little attention to the influence of prostatectomy upon the sexual power. I have repeatedly stated that: "Retention of urine, and other very disagreeable symptoms, always allied with more or less severe pain, must be relieved first, and the patient's life should be made bearable and if possible prolonged." The patients are mostly advanced in years, and their sexual capacity is, as a rule, of no moment to them.

Another circumstance, why the effects of prostatectomy upon sexual power cannot be utilized in judging the endocrine activity of the prostate is, that one has to depend upon the patient's statements, and these are frequently not very reliable.

Most instructive experiments were made on dogs by Serralach and Parés. They found that complete ablation of the prostate gland suppresses all sexual activity and dries up the secretion



of the sexual glands. When however, such animals are fed prostatic extracts the testicles do not atrophy, spermatozoa do not disappear and ejaculation continues.

I have frequently obtained fairly good results from the feeding of small quantities (3 to 5 grains) of desiccated animal prostate gland in senile hypertrophy when patients refused operation. Recently I add small doses of prostate (1 grain) to other glandular preparations prescribed to impotent patients, and find that sometimes the beneficial influence is increased, I have never seen toxic symptoms following the use of prostatic preparations, but they are possible, and surely do not speak for the indifference or uselessness of the remedy. French authors, who consider the dog's prostatic extract more efficient, recommend small doses at first.

Such an excellent observer as my late friend Valentine said in 1902 that those given to sexual intercourse throughout a long life are less prone to senile prostatic enlargement than those who led so-called virtuous lives.

There is very little doubt about the immensity of the endocrine activities of *the testicle*. The effects of a natural or an artificially induced dysfunction or absence of the testes is too obvious, too well known, there is no argument left for the most skeptical. Long before Brown-Séquard, the father of modern opotherapy, and long before anything was even dreamed of endocrinology, the Chinese, Roman and Arabian physicians, in fact physicians of all times and climes recommended the ingestion of the testicles from various animals as a remedy for sexual impotence. It was a crude, but, no doubt, frequently effective empiric form of organotherapy.

It would lead too far to enter into all the controversies in regard to what and which part of the testicles is the real organ of internal secretion. While we hope that the active principle may be isolated in the near future, from a practical standpoint it is sufficient to know that castration results in the formation of a common asexual type. Castration does not cause the man to become womanlike, nor the woman to become man-like, but both return to a common youthful type of a protracted stage of underdevelopment.

A congenital underdevelopment of the testes and senile atrophy and dysfunction are more or less, and corresponding to the degree, equivalent to castration. In spite of opposition of some French authors, it appears that the Leydig cells produce the powerful gonad hormone, and this becomes active in the presence of normal endocrine glands and somatoplasm.

Practical experience proves that the internal, the hypodermatic and the intravenous use of orchitic preparations are very effective



in a number of cases of sexual impotence, and that they never cause ill effects. Even large doses (10 grains and more) of such preparations cause no discomfort whatever, no marked influence upon blood-pressure or kidney function, but orchitic preparations, when given internally by themselves, do not produce any too obvious effects. While there can be no doubt about their general stimulating action even in cases where suggestion is out of question, the influence upon the sexual power itself is not very pronounced. Therefore, and in view of the powerful effects they have when given in conjunction with other glandular preparations, we must come to the conclusion that the gonad-hormone produced by the so-called "puberty gland" really can exert its influence only in the presence of a normal, or at least, a normally functioning endocrine system.

We have an absolute parallel when using *ovarian preparations*. The splendid results obtained in ovarian dysfunction, dysmenorrhea, general irritability and sexual frigidity, cannot be obtained when using any ovarian preparation alone, only when they are fed together with pituitary, thyroid and eventually adrenal preparations.

There is no use talking about suggestion when one can readily see cases that were subjected for years to all kinds of treatments and overfed with all kinds of suggestions, and who under a properly directed organotherapy become transformed into healthy and therefore happy, more loving and more lovable women.

The fact that "the endocrine organs are linked together so as to form a system of reciprocally dependent organs (hormonopoietic system)" is gradually becoming clear to clinicians and even to scientists.

Valéry Radot properly states that "a gland cannot function separately; there exists between one gland and the others a connection of action and reaction, implying a complexity which sets in a new light the symptoms observed clinically." I should say, complexity!, and cannot see how physiologists and laboratory scientists are ever going to disentangle this complexity without the aid of the clinician. Of course, clinical experimenting must under all circumstances be strictly subject to the actual interests and requirements of the patient himself.

We know that the thyroid and the pituitary glands and the suprarenal cortex are essential factors to a proper establishment of the reproductive system, and we know that the puberty gland is the supreme determining factor in the establishment and the maintenance of the sexual qualities; therefore, I cannot see how we can accomplish anything without *pluriglandular organotherapy* in most cases of sexual impotence.



When we further consider that most persons, suffering from sexual impotence, mainly elderly people, also are anemic, we must add a good dose (3 to 5 grains) of hemoglobin, and lo and behold, we have the shotgun-prescription. And 'horribile dictu' the majority are glad to have it.

It is obvious from what was said that each case must be studied, and that one cannot proceed by any set rules and schedules; high or low blood-pressure, the obese and the emaciated, the plethoric and the anemic, the phlegmatic and the irritable ones, etc., cannot be treated alike.

Even with the limited knowledge about the endocrine system we are justified in our belief that there are glands indispensable to the maintenance of sexual and general vigor, therefore of youth and prolongation of life, and we know enough to know that the puberty gland is one of them.

In view of experiments and clinical experiments, too numerous to be disregarded, we know that feeding of the various glandular preparations in proper combination is effective in the treatment of premature senility and in sexual frigidity. While all attempts at standardization of glandular preparations necessarily have not resulted in very much so far, it is true that one can depend on the products of reliable manufacturers. No doubt that some batches placed on the market may have been partly prepared from inert glands, and then the results cannot be very good, but the same holds for fluid preparations, for injections and even for glands used in transplantation.

In animal experiments it seemed that the results obtained by feeding were inferior to those by injection, but we must consider that most of the experiments concerned cases where one or the other gland was removed, and the animal was in possession of an otherwise intact endocrine system. Such a condition is rather rare in human patients, and I have found that almost constant feeding of the necessary preparation is preferable to desultory injections, though there is no doubt that when the deficiency of some gland is obvious, intravenous injections considerably enhance the effects of feeding, and vice versa.

As only extracts can be injected, we can readily see that injections cannot replace the action of a whole gland, and nothing can equal the action of one's own intact gland in an intact body. We must not ask for the impossible.

And yet the question may arise what is "impossible?" Many things that we consider impossible today may be possible tomorrow.

When Lydston first came with experiments on the *implantation*



of the generative glands taken from dead human bodies, I said in 1915 that these experiments are of immense ingenuity and offer possibilities of which we only dared to dream, cautiously I added; "So far we must admire, though we lack the courage of following him in his field."

The medical profession took no notice of Lydston's work until in 1919 a French surgeon awakened the press of the whole world by his own claims.

There is no doubt that Lydston was the first to perform sexual gland transplantation on any human being, but in 1849 Berthold reported in the 'Archiv für Anatomie und Physiologie' on experimental transplantation of testicles in roosters. No one paid any attention to Berthold in 1849, and the American medical profession took notice of Lydston's work and that of his followers only when the newspapers of the whole world began to give sensational reports, and then they joined in the more or less witty jokes about monkey glands. And while the jokes go on, a number of scientifically inclined surgeons are keeping up the fascinating work of homo- and hetero-transplantation.

Notwithstanding dogmatic contradictions and ridiculing, no matter from what and from how high places it may come, the effects of a properly and successfully performed transplantation are unmistakable.

There is no doubt that next to the proper selection of the transplant material the *technic* is of paramount importance. Proper material can sometimes be obtained without offending ethics and law, the technic is a question that is up to the individual surgeon.

From what I have learned and seen so far in the various parts of America and Europe, Lichtenstein's technic seemed to me the best until I saw Max Thorek's work at Chicago. I really believe that the latter is solving the problems of material and technic at the same time.

With regard to transplantation there are still too many questions open, too many difficulties to overcome, therefore it is not generally available, but autotransplantation should positively be resorted to whenever disease or trauma make the removal of the sexual gland necessary, even if only small parts can be saved for the unfortunate victim.

Stanley of San Quentin in California had the ingenious idea of a *simplification of transplantation* and devised a method of injecting the ram's semisolid testicular substance subcutaneously with an appropriate syringe armed with a large caliber needle. The proceeding is easily done and painless. Stanley is very modest in his claims as to the results obtained. I have repeatedly seen



very good effects upon the sexual power, notably in a few cases where a suggestive effect could be absolutely excluded.

Though Retterer and Voronoff are positively sure that the epithelial cells of the seminiferous tubes furnish the plasma, the resorption of which determines the sexual characteristics, it is now pretty well established that the spermatogenetic cells and Sertoli's cells have no leading part in the internal secretory function of the testes, at least cannot exert their power without the action of the interstitial cells. There is no doubt that, for some reason or other, *the interstitial cells* begin to proliferate as soon as the spermatogenetic parts of the testes begin to degenerate. We know, though there are occasionally a few contradictory findings, that, as a rule, the interstitial cells are increased in number and even more so in size at periods of heat in animals, decreased during periods of sexual inactivity, mainly during hibernation. We know that the condition of the interstitial cells is of great importance in regard to individual sexual capacity. It is a fact that about five or six months after vasectomy spermatogenesis ceases in the testicle in question, Leydig's and Sertoli's cells persist, Leydig's interstitial tissue proliferates. Thus we come to *Steinach's operation* which consists in the severing and ligating of the thoroughly isolated vas deferens.

We must admit that, unfortunately, it is not an immutable law that lasting over-production of the so-called interstitial internal secretion cells results in lastingly increased internal secretion, but we are justified in supposing that such an increased internal secretion cannot influence organs and their substratum that are in no condition to react, and that is the reason why the effects of a Steinach operation are greatly enhanced by a proper opotherapeutic support of the other glands of internal secretion, and explains all the claims of some physicians that we must simultaneously employ all other means at our disposal to improve the patient's general condition. It is self-understood that a man suffering from sexual and general decrepitude, be it premature or not, should be placed under proper hygienic conditions, properly fed and exercised, fed on proper organic and other tonics and, if possible, made generally happy by change of environment or by good and jolly company. All this is necessary before a Steinach operation is performed, and remains necessary after it. The only and great difference is in the evident benefit one sees afterwards, while all and everything may have failed before.

The surgeon who cuts a man's vas deferens without any regard for the maintenance of the innervation and circulation of and in the testicle, and then simply lets the patient run away, cannot expect good results.



If there were any further need to emphasize the importance of the condition of the interstitial cells, one only has to point to the difference of their condition in the young and vigorous and the decrepit and old. Wherever we find the cells numerous and rich in protoplasm there is also youth or at least vigor, while pigmental atrophy counteracts the value of an increased number. It is not a mere guess when we associate the rekindling of sexual activity in old men, which is frequently being observed, to a passing increase in the number of the interstitial cells. As this increase is sometimes passing quite rapidly, so is also the flaring up of sexual capacity which accompanies it, and it is rather unfortunate that sometimes old people are led to commit foolish acts because they bank upon resources that burn up rapidly and disappear, never to return again.

The opinions in regard to the effects of the Steinach operation naturally are different; some operators are enthusiastic, some are doubtful, and many physicians tend to treat it with contempt; the simple truth, however, is that properly performed, ligation and severing of one or both vasa deferentia invariably benefits the patient. Amongst the many persons operated upon, I have yet to find a single one who did not show various improvements of the bodily condition, or who would have any reason to regret the slight operation.

At some future time I shall tabulate all my cases, but will at this time briefly report two typical experiences in both of which a suggestive influence was positively excluded.

A well-known San Franciscan, a retired merchant, five weeks less than 80 years old was brought to me by his daughter. While in former times I used to meet the man frequently, I had not seen him for over a year, and could notice a great change; he was listless and tottering. I received the report that the old man swoons frequently, had lost his memory and was quite helpless. Examination confirmed the self-suggesting diagnosis of senility. When his two sons came to see me I advised a Steinach operation. My argument was that it was not a question of prolonging a useless life, less a question of restoring sexual power, but a simple question of making life, while it lasted, bearable.

The patient was told nothing, promised nothing, and took no interest whatever in the proceeding. Under local anesthesia the vasectomy was performed on both sides. Two months after the operation the patient presided at a very jolly party in honor of his 80th birthday, made a witty speech, noticed and complimented the ladies present. Upon inquiry he reported that, while he gave up all foolish thoughts of love for many years, he thinks that



## ORGANOTHERAPY—VECKI

he might be good for something yet; and that is as far as he would go. His children report that he takes again his walks, takes interest in life and in whatever happens, and did not swoon for over six weeks. The general improvement keeps up at this time nine months after the operation.

A well-known physician laughed in my face when I spoke about the Steinach operation to him. What could that accomplish? He simply would not believe it could do anything. As a dare he brought to my office an old man from whom no information of any kind could be obtained, not even his age, but who must have been about 75 years old. This man was listless to such a degree that he would remain indefinitely wherever he was placed, and had no more sense than a one year old child in regard to urination and defecation. Extremely docile in every respect, he meekly submitted to any examination and manipulation; the Steinach operation was performed on both sides, and then he was taken home. For weeks I heard only jokes about the patient, but five months later he was helping in a cigar-store, then left for his native country. And a one-sided Steinach operation was recently done on the scoffing physician himself.

Matter by itself is inert, it needs impulses to make it act. Shall we allow the inert matter to increase in the aging body without any attempt at resistance? Shall we follow Brisbane's advice when he says: "The best way to restore energy in the old is to live quietly while you are old, die quietly when the time comes and begin all over again in a body brand new from head to foot"?

Unfortunately most people will have their doubts about that "brand new body," and, then, who knows what kind of glands of internal secretion it may have? However, I think that we are justified in hanging on to our own body for a while longer. Can it be done? I think organotherapy in its various phases will help to a certain extent, and that therein also lies the future of artificial rejuvenation and prolongation of life.

You may say that I am an optimist, and I am glad if I am. Optimism, hedged in by cautious conservatism, has done well by many. If everybody were an optimist, there would be no more wars, no one would begrudge his fellowman a few cheerful moments, nor to any old man his Indian Summer.

Physicians' Building, 516 Sutter St.

## LITERATURE.

Barker: On abnormalities of the Endocrine Functions of the Gonads in the Male. *American Journal of the Medical Sciences*. January, 1915.



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

- Barker: Endocrinology. Journal American Medical Association, July 8, 1922.
- Cannon: Some conditions controlling Internal Secretion. Journal American Medical Association, July 8, 1922.
- Carlson: Hypofunction and Hyperfunction of the ductless Glands. Journal American Medical Association, July 8, 1922.
- Endocrinology: Bulletin of the Association for the Study of Internal Secretion.
- Goetsch: Influence of Pituitary Feeding on Growth and Sexual Development. Bulletin of Johns Hopkins Hospital, February, 1916.
- Hoskins: Some Principles of Endocrinology Applicable to Organotherapy. Journal American Medical Association, July 8, 1922.
- Howell: Text-Book of Physiology, 7th edition, 1918.
- Lipschütz: Die Pubertätsdrüse, Bern, 1919.
- Léopold Levi: Opotherapic Endocrinienne, Paris, 1922.
- Lisser: Hypopituitarism and Its Treatment, 1922.
- Pottenger: The relation of Endocrinology to Vegetative or Visceral Neurology. N. Y. Medical Journal, March 2, 1921.
- Retterer et Voronoff: La Glande genitale male. Paris, 1921.
- Stekel: Die Geschlechtskälte der Frau, Urban und Schwarzenberg, 1921.
- Stekel: Die Impotenz des Mannes. 2nd Edition. Urban und Schwarzenberg, 1921.
- Vecki: Sexual Impotence, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th editions. Saunders, 1901, 1912, 1915, 1920.
- Voronoff: Greffes Testiculaires. Paris, 1923.
- Weil: Sexualreform and Sexualwissenschaft. Stuttgart, 1922.



(For The Journal of Sexology and Psychoanalysis)

## JEALOUSY AND ITS TREATMENT, WITH REPPORTS OF CASES

By S. A. TANNENBAUM, M. D., New York

### I

No one likes to admit that he is jealous. That is probably one reason why the psychanalyst is but rarely called upon to treat patients for morbid erotic jealousy and why psychoanalytic literature contains so little on the subject. In most of the cases analyzed, jealousy, when it occurs, is only one symptom among many and rarely calls for or gets special consideration; usually it gets only passing notice as one of the patient's less characteristic traits. Now and then, however,—and by no means infrequently—jealousy is the dominant symptom of a psychoneurosis (or “nervous breakdown”) and a conspicuous symptom in certain forms of insanity and in chronic alcoholism. Much more frequently than is generally known to be the case, jealousy is the cause of a large number of nervous symptoms (neurasthenia, psychasthenia, hysteria), although the victim of the affliction does not complain of jealousy or see any relationship between his jealousy and the symptoms which cause him to consult a physician or a psychotherapist. (In these cases one who is careless in the use of language would say that the jealousy was “unconscious.”) The following report of such a case treated by me recently is of interest as illustrating this fact and as serving to throw light on many problems connected with jealousy.

Mr. C., aged twenty-nine years, fair-haired, blue-eyed, weighing one hundred and thirty-six pounds; travelling salesman; married three years; no children; one of a family of nine children (six girls, three boys); lives with his wife in C. Physical examination reveals a normal heart, lung and kidneys; no deformities; myopia and astigmatism corrected by glasses; teeth, nose and ears perfectly normal. Pulse 98, Blood Pressure 115; Hemoglobin 85%. Pupils normal; reflexes exaggerated; nervous and rapid in his movements. Drinks coffee and tea once a day, smokes fifteen to eighteen cigarettes a day. No syphilis; first attack of gonorrhea ten years ago, lasted four or five months and was complicated by acute prostatitis; second attack eight or nine years ago, lasted five or six weeks; third attack four years ago, lasted five weeks. Had no other serious illness. I shall tell the rest of the patient's story more or less in his own words, but shall leave out matters not related to our present subject.

“My nervousness began a year and a half ago. I get palpitation after eating heartily and after any excitement; with it goes a feeling of weakness, a sort of all-gone feeling. I get attacks of



weakness even without palpitation, even when I'm in the street; I anticipate something happening to me and I have to stop walking and lean against something for support; I'm afraid I'll fall or faint or become helpless or drop dead, and then I get palpitation. I get this almost all the time. Sometimes I feel this coming on when I'm speaking to a gathering of salesmen and have to cut my speech short. Under this strain I get a severe pain on top of my head or in the temples, and a sort of strained feeling. Sometimes as I walk along the street my legs get numb, especially the left one, and I feel as if I were walking on sticks. At times I feel as if I would die and I must hurry home or to my hotel and lie down. I dream of the weirdest things all the time. At times I get dizzy in the street and I have to stop till it passes off. I had a spell of these symptoms about five years ago but it didn't last long. Several times during the past five years I have awakened from sleep with fright and palpitation, so that I had to send for a doctor.

"I have been treated by physicians all over the country and they all agree that I have no organic ailment. For the past year I have been treated for an acid stomach. I'm inclined to be constipated. My chief trouble is a kind of nervous feeling. Sexually there is nothing the matter with me; we have coitus three or four times a week. Prior to my marriage I used to have frequent pollutions accompanied by lascivious dreams; but during the past three or four months I've had pollutions again, about once a week. No; I have never had sexual dreams of an abnormal kind. At present my wife is home in C. She doesn't like to accompany me in my travels and we can't afford such a luxury, as my income averages only from sixty to seventy-five dollars a week."

Inasmuch as Mr. C. is not in the best physical condition (low blood pressure, anemia), I advised him to stop smoking and prescribed for him a tonic of Iron, Manganese Dioxide and Strychnine. For the nervous symptoms I advised analysis.

Session 2. My mind often flounders and I anticipate all sorts of things happening to me. I don't like crowds but I compel myself to go to them. In a crowd I get excited. At a movie I get nervous and fidgety and my heart pumps so that I have to get out. Of late I get no enjoyment out of anything; I get depressed, melancholic, and can't force myself to see the bright side of things. Since my talk with you yesterday I feel finer than I have felt for years. When I'm away from home I always feel uncomfortable and want to get back to my wife although we haven't been getting along well lately. We scrap a great deal



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

probably on account of my mental condition . . . I'm suspicious of her although I have no concrete reason for being so. The truth is, I'm very jealous of her though at times I know that my jealousy is absurd. I had known her only two weeks when I married her; it was a case of love at first sight. I proposed to her the second time I saw her.

A friend of mine who introduced me to her had praised her to the skies and told me that he had spent a night with her but without having had relations with her. I'm sure he told the truth. When I called on her I found her to be as beautiful and charming as my friend had described her. We had some drinks and then went to bed. I had all my clothes on. She was menstruating at the time, so nothing happened. A few days later I called again; this time we did have coitus although she slept through it all and seemed not to know what had happened until I woke her. I was troubled and conscience-stricken and afraid that she might be pregnant. The next day I proposed to her and she accepted me. Then I had to go away on a trip for a week during which time I worried a great deal about her and pictured her going wrong if I didn't marry her and I'd be to blame for her fall. I had some misgivings about marrying her but decided to go through with it and do my best to be happy. I knew that she had been out a lot with men and was intoxicated with the gay life of C. She had been living away from her family and had consequently enjoyed a great deal of freedom.

With my marriage my views became changed. I wanted new friends and a new kind of life. I took my marriage seriously and did not look at another woman for nine or ten months. Then Ethel—my wife—became pregnant; but she didn't want to have a child and had an abortion done, against my will. It seemed to me that she didn't love me and that she did not take marriage seriously. By this time I had noticed, with resentment, that she allowed men to be familiar with her, let them pet her and even kiss her, and showed too much leg in public. All this cut me like a whip; I had been very scrupulous not to look at other women. We have had frequent arguments about this sort of thing. Even during the first week of our married life I saw her wrapped in another fellow's arms in our house and kissing each other. Since then I don't like to invite any of our friends to our home.

If she tells me of meeting other men, or if she praises them, it sets me on fire. My jealousy has caused a split between me and her family. I had a quarrel with them when I saw her sister's husband take liberties with her; he neglected his own wife



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

but played a lot with mine. Ethel has an enticing figure and attracts men; she is twenty-five years old, is five feet seven inches tall and is a very pretty blonde. She has a free and easy disposition and can't call a man down if he tries anything. That's why I have no confidence in her.

She was pregnant again a year and a half ago and again submitted to an abortion. We do not practice contraception. Ethel is very libidinous and as I'm home about three days a week we have coitus about five times a week, unless we have been quarreling. Ethel craves for cunnilingus but I very rarely gratify her; I have done so about five times since I'm married. My refusal to gratify her in this may cause much of our unhappiness. She has occasionally practiced fellatio, partially or completely. Usually we do these things only partially and merely as a preliminary to coitus. All this has caused no loss of respect for each other and I think I still love her.

We quarrel about money matters too. She loves to go out, to the movies and to the theatre. When I'm out with her anywhere I keep watching her to see whether she is looking at the men; when she meets good-looking men she raves about them to me and analyzes their features. If she accompanied me on my travels I would feel better; when I'm away from her I imagine all sorts of things happening at home. Now I never go on trips that last longer than three days because I feel better when I'm at home. She likes night life and wants me to take her out a good deal, and because I don't do so we quarrel. Because I'm uncomfortable in her presence in public places, I prefer to stay home and let her go out with a girl friend. I have at times suspected her with different men but I always dismiss these thoughts for lack of evidence. She does such funny things! She exposes her figure on the slightest provocation and shows not the slightest modesty in the presence of her mother, her sisters or myself. My mother taught us all to be very modest; she once beat one of my sisters for coming in the living room in a kimono. In the summer months Ethel loves to wear the thinnest garments and goes out without an underskirt; when she does her morning's shopping she is always too scantily clothed. At night she never thinks of pulling the shades down when she undresses. When I walk along the street I think of these things and that probably accounts for my getting sick in the street. This never occurred to me before. Before my marriage I never had these symptoms.

Session 3. I would be jealous of Ethel even if she were not good looking, just because she is my wife. Before I was married I once beat up a fellow because he looked in a wrong way at the



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

girl with whom I was. Now I blame my wife if I see anything wrong, because I have no confidence in her; she is too free and easygoing with people. Though we have quarrelled a great deal about this, she shows no disposition to change. If she ever called a man down for taking liberties with her I would have more confidence in her; she says she doesn't take these things seriously.

I have no doubts about my ability to satisfy her, either socially, intellectually, financially or sexually. She takes absolutely no interest in anything, never reads a book or a magazine, and gets bored when people discuss the topics of the day or scientific or literary subjects. And yet she is by no means stupid, for she was a good stenographer before we were married.

She once told me she had been out with some fellow before our marriage and I had an inward brainstorm but said nothing. but I wondered what had happened between them. I don't like her to meet any of the men she had known before our marriage. She had told me of wild parties she had been to as a girl, where they drank, danced, petted each other, and that some of the girls even had intercourse, but that she had done nothing. Of course, I was not abstinent before my marriage, but since then I had intercourse with another woman for the first time half a year ago, and then only because Ethel and I were at swords' points and I was very despondent. I regretted it when it was over. We are both quick-tempered and our quarrels are tempestuous affairs; her temper is getting worse daily. I lapsed again two months ago, after I had been away from home for ten days.

Ethel is passionate only during coitus. She loves to excite men's passions. She once told me how smart she was to let fellows make love to her and get excited and then leave them in the lurch. She never makes sexual advances to me. Of late she is very nervous; she gets upset about trifles and sulks for hours. I know that we are drifting wide apart. I'd like to call it all closed; lately I've even thought of a separation or a divorce,—it would be best for both of us. A year ago I made her an offer of a temporary separation during which I would support her as heretofore, but she refused because of what people would think. If I broach the subject of divorce to her she says that I want to get rid of her. I do not think that she can modify her behavior; she is not strong-willed and I fear that she will not be able to resist temptation. I know men and I know that very few will fail to take advantage of such a woman as Ethel.

I would have greater confidence in her if I did not know the things she had done before her marriage. Because she yielded to me I doubt whether she resisted the others. And when I woke



her and told her of the *emissio in vaginam* she didn't seem to be at all disturbed though I was greatly worried. She woke her room mate who was sleeping in another room and told her what had happened; this girl then advised her to douche. Neither of them seemed to take the matter seriously.

Before my marriage I approved of the single standard, but my wife's conduct has changed all this. When she asks if I ever have anything to do with other women I say I do not. She is constantly telling me she loves me and never passes by me without giving me a pet or putting her arm around me or kissing me. Recently she even showed signs of jealousy when I told her, falsely, that I had taken a girl to the theatre.

Sometimes I get sick in the street even when I'm with her, but I am sure it is not because she looks at passing men, but I watch her to see if she looks at the men. I don't like her to know that I'm watching her, but she knows. Life must be as miserable for her as it is for me. I shun the company of women because I don't want to give Ethel an excuse for flirting. I do not think that I would be happy if I were divorced, for I find that I cannot get Ethel out of my mind; when I compare her with other women none seems to be as nice as she. I don't think other men could resist her form and her sexual behavior. I admire her beautiful red hair and her beauty as she lies in bed.

I began to indulge in coitus when I was fourteen. I tried to keep away from good girls because my mother had brought me up to respect women, and nice girls always made me think of my sisters. I used to have a great many sexual dreams; these dreams were always of women I didn't know, the children of my mind, not prostitutes, and in most of these dreams I did nothing but look at the women. I didn't object to smutty jokes if they were clever; I enjoyed reading the Decameron and such things. When I was sixteen I came across a set of obscene pictures and bought them. At the age of twelve a school-fellow introduced me to the art of masturbation. The thought of homosexual or perverse practices disgust me. While masturbating, I indulged in fantasies of coitus. I continued this practice till I was eighteen because coitus with prostitutes was not as pleasurable as these fantasies.

Session 4. I'm feeling fine the last three days and my mind is perfectly clear. Two nights ago I went to a party and had a fine time, notwithstanding the big crowd, and had only one attack of pain about the heart which passed away in a few minutes.

Yes, I have had thoughts of revenge by exposing my wife's



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

conduct, not by injuring her physically. I have thought of watching her, of checking up her telephone calls, etc. I often resolved not to be jealous but it never lasts longer than three or four days. She talks pleasantly to clerks in the stores, to the iceman, the milkman, and I get furious. At times she has threatened to leave me, and at such times I told her, that I was satisfied to have her go; but she stayed.

Before my marriage I was very easily attracted to women, going from one to the other easily. I feel that I have given up a lot in getting married; now I can't go about or do as I please. In yielding to her wish to live in C., I have given up my New York friends and my family. At times I wonder if marriage is worth it and at such times my thoughts are very bitter. When Ethel and I are good friends I love married life.

When I'm away from her I think only of what she is doing. I would prefer to live in New York because I would have my friends and my family and Ethel would not be near the men she had known before her marriage. She is an easy liar and lies even about trifles, probably to save me from getting into a temper.

At times it has occurred to me that Ethel would be glad if I died but I never have any fantasies of her death. I have never struck her or even thought of it. I never was mischievous and never played practical jokes; I was always chicken-hearted about such things. It's a curious thing but I love her more when away from her than when with her. I have often gone away with the intention of not seeing her for a week but returned home the next day.

I didn't realize how jealous I am until we began to talk of it here, and now it seems I can talk of nothing else. When we quarrel she says derogatory things about me and speaks of other men who have larger incomes; but when we make up she takes it all back again. She has a much better home now than she had before she was married. I had a very queer dream last night: my head had been cut off and my body had been laid in another room for future use; but I continued to live; when I went to get my body I found it was all mussed up as if someone had stepped on it. That's all I can recall of it. I have many crazy dreams; this one recalls nothing to me and is very remote from anything I can think of. It suggests a spiritualistic idea: the separation of the head, i. e., the mind, from the body. That reminds me that you said that my bodily symptoms are the results of what goes on in my mind. The body being mussed up, must, therefore, stand for my body mussed up by my thoughts. The idea of



decapitation doesn't suggest anything to me. Oh, yes you must be right in thinking that here is a reference to what you told me two days ago about psychanalysis being like the axe in Sir Walter Raleigh's story: before he was beheaded he took up the axe and said. "This is a sharp medicine, but it cures all diseases." The dream must mean, then, that I expect this treatment to cure me, and that I realize the mental origin of my symptoms.

I have been very happy the last few days, for I think I'm getting cured. Yesterday afternoon your quotation from Sir Walter came to my mind as I was sitting down to write my wife a letter apologizing to her and her family. Here is a curious coincidence. Two nights ago I happened to be with one of my favorite nephews, a little boy two and a half years old, who says on all occasions "I'll cut your head off." It's strange, too, that in the dream the leg was out of order; that night my leg had been numb for a short time, but it hasn't bothered me since, though I have walked around a lot. At first my right foot used to get numb, but never the right leg; of late it has been only the left leg and foot. I still indulge in a great many sexual fantasies except when I'm not feeling well. You may be right in thinking that my being ill keeps me going straight; I know it keeps me from indulging myself. If I want Ethel to go straight I must do so. When I feel well I think of sex; when I'm ill I want to get under cover.

Session 5. Last night I had a queer dream about my favorite sister. (I omit this dream and the associations to it, retaining only what I consider significant in the present connection.) This sister is the only one who knows of my troubles with my wife, but I think I made a mistake to take her into my confidence; she is not sufficiently broad-minded to see Ethel's side of the case; she advised me to leave Ethel. She and her husband quarrel occasionally but on the whole they get along pretty well. There is a strain of nervousness in my whole family. My mother's brother is a nervous wreck. One of my brothers is very jealous of his wife though she is very fat and ungainly. He also suffers from nervous indigestion. In our childhood we were all dreadfully jealous of one another. We were always on the alert to see that mother didn't play favorites. We were all the more jealous because we were very poor. I was my mother's pet because I used to take pride in earning money after school hours and bringing it home. One day my mother gave me two cents to buy a rubber ball on a rubber string. That was a fortune to me. That night I lay awake all night thinking of my mother's kindness to me and I cried so that they thought



I was sick. Mother used to favor me in many ways and had great ambitions for me. My brothers ran away from home but I always stuck to mother and gave her what I earned. Our family was always divided into cliques. When my father was forty he deserted my mother and nine children. When she couldn't stand his drunkenness and brutality any longer she put him out. She was a remarkable woman and managed to send us all through public school and I even got three years of college. We were always jealous of one another and had lot of squabbles. Jealousy is very strong in our family. My brother was always self-sacrificing and I often wonder where my sisters got their meanness and selfishness. I never could show any of my sisters any affection and used to envy Ethel's friendly relations with her brother.

Session 6. My married life is a continued succession of quarrelling and making up. She does many things that grate on me; I have to watch her constantly and tell her how to do even the simplest things. I realize, of course, that in these petty squabbles I am really giving disguised expression to my jealousy. Our friends think we get on remarkably well. I find all sorts of excuses for not going anywhere with her: at home I don't have to watch her.

I feel that I have told you everything; I'm feeling very well and am glad I came here. Yesterday I completed certain arrangements which promise to double if not treble my income. I'm thinking of renting a more expensive apartment and buying new furniture. This has been a wonderful week for me; it's the first time in two years that I have been happy for a whole week. I realize that there is nothing the matter with me and that I need not be afraid of melancholia. Till this week I have been eaten up with miserable thoughts and have envied everybody. C. is a bad city, as all travelling salesmen know; New York is saintly compared with it. Would you advise me to move to a small town? (No; a small town is no guarantee of virtue.)

I ought to tell you that during my first coitus with Ethel there was no evidence of a rupture of the hymen. That has often troubled me. (I explain to the patient that an intact hymen is no proof of virginity and that the absence of hemorrhage during the first coitus does not prove the absence of virginity.) I love children and would like Ethel to have a child; it might mean happiness to both of us. Would her two abortions predispose her to sickness if she became pregnant now? (Not if the abortion had not been complicated by infection or obstructive peritonitis; whether this occurred or not, can be determined by



a physical examination.) Would our indulgence in perverse practices tend to make our children abnormal? (No.)

I wonder what is the meaning of my dizziness. (It may mean no more than mental confusion.) I have noticed that at such times I think a million things.—Lately I've read a lot about thyroid treatment; do you think I need it? (No.) Can you give me any advice? (Don't take your wife's exposures of her body too seriously. Call her attention to her transgressions gently and persuasively. Don't treat her as if you owned her. Look on her as a good-looking girl who hasn't grown up and who is still a child in her desire for flattery. Remember that she has nothing but her body with which to beget admiration and that in her desire for men's flattering attentions she is like most good-looking women. Remember, above all, that if you scold her or quarrel with her you will be driving her into adultery. With love you will accomplish more than with force or threats.)

Session 7. Awoke depressed this morning after a dream of fighting off a dog or a cat,—it was a terrible fight. The animal I was fighting off may be a symbol for jealousy, as you suggest. I have been trying to fight off this passion. Ethel hasn't been as satisfied with me as I have with her, and that has given me a kind of inferiority feeling. If she went with another man it would hurt my pride. Do you think I could go back and live peacefully with her? (Yes, if you will be ruled by reason and make allowances for your wife's narcissism.) If I can't I want to break it up altogether. Do you think she was guilty of infidelity? (I have no reason for thinking so.) Since my coming here I have had no uneasiness in the street.

To depreciate the men Ethel knew, I used to lie about them to her and used to tell her about their philanderings. I did this so that she would not think that they were paying attentions to her only. But she was on to me and would find things for which to praise them. That always made me jealous. At times I'm sure she purposely makes me jealous, especially if I neglect her. At times she flirts with men just to see if she can still get admiration,—she has no other interests; all she talks of is her shape, her weight and her food; sensible talk bores her to death. She doesn't like to have visitors because they scratch the mahogany furniture and she doesn't like to go among sensible people because there she is only a wallflower. All she wants is diversion. It's very difficult for me to entertain her because she can't keep her mind on anything; she can't even concentrate on a game of cards.

A big city like New York would furnish us sufficient diver-



sion but it might also be a means of enabling her to get away with things. I often picture her as going down the line and becoming an outcast. My work doesn't interest her; when I come back from my trips she never shows any curiosity about what or how I had been doing. When she tells me anything I show my interest by asking a lot of questions, and she resents that for she thinks I'm trying to catch her in a lie. I used to be very romantic and sentimental and indulged in fantasies of being married to a wonderful girl; but my marriage is anything but like my dreams. I wonder if her demonstrations of affection are put on.

She calls everybody by pet names; everybody is "Honey" to her. I must admit that her bringing-up was different from mine, her sisters also are lavish in the use of terms of endearment; they discuss all matters very frankly. Ethel has a nice word and a smile for everybody. When I go back home I'll have to take all these things into consideration and try to get Ethel interested in the things that interest me.

Session 8. I'm beginning to realize that a great deal of my nervousness was a sort of excuse for staying home with Ethel; probably that's why I didn't like to go to places where I'd meet groups of people. I don't know how to act when I'm with people who do not interest me. When I wake in the morning I feel sluggish and have no pep and just sit around doing nothing. I don't get enough exercise. (You must remedy this).

I feel that I have told you my whole story and I think that I'll be able to manage Ethel; if I'm nice to her I can do a great deal with her. When we got married she was very extravagant but now that she knows how I stand financially she is economical. After all, she is not a dumbbell and I think I can get her interested in music (she plays the piano a little) and in the theatre. I must learn to keep my temper and not be tyrannical. Do you think it would be advisable for us to move to New York? (Yes). I'm leaving for C. this afternoon and shall keep you informed as to how we get on.

(The above case is reported not as showing that jealousy can be cured by psychoanalysis — scientific "confession" combined with scientific explanation of symptoms — but as showing how neurotic mental and physical manifestations may result from emotional disturbances consequent upon conditions with which the individual is, for various reasons, unequal to cope satisfactorily. Mr. C's jealousy is sufficiently well founded and he did not know what to do about his wife's conduct; he is torn between conflicting desires — and the result is neurosis. Unless his



wife's behavior will change — as a result of analysis or something more drastic—he will continue to be jealous but he will be free from the symptoms that brought him to me).

## II.

A somewhat different type of jealousy is presented by the following case (referred to me some six years ago by Dr. Laase). Mr. P., fairly well-educated Swiss, aged 42, tall, handsome, healthy looking, stockily built and well groomed; haggard and worried, restless and uneasy; gives impression of neatness and cleanness; looks prosperous; travelling salesman; lives in New York but spends much of his time on the road, several weeks at a time. For several months past has been surly, irritable, quarrelsome, morose, impatient, and jealous. Jealous outbursts getting more frequent, more noisy, and more unendurable. Sleeps very poorly, awakes about 4.30 every morning with a severe headache and can't fall asleep again; is very amorous and demonstrative on awaking and can be pacified by his wife only by constant asseverations of her love for him. At times he admits that he knows his suspicions are groundless and his jealousy absurd; at other times he is absolutely convinced of his wife's guilt and threatens to kill her and himself. His jealousy centers especially on one man, a neighbor, whom he has known many years and who often plays cards with him in his home but whom he has never liked because of his free and easy manner with women and his fondness for telling smutty jokes. Mr. P., on the contrary, has the highest respect for women, never tells a vulgar joke, has never had intercourse with any woman but his wife, and has never desired extra-marital sexual relations. He knows nothing of perversions or of inversion.

Mr. and Mrs. P. have been married seventeen years and they have only one child, a son of sixteen. Mrs. P.'s delivery was a difficult one and the child had to be taken with forceps. When Mr. P. saw how ill his wife was he promised her never to impregnate her again. The promise was easily made but not so easy to keep. Coitus condomatus was so repugnant to his esthetic sensibilities that Mr. P. refused to resort to it and was compelled to do so with the utmost reluctance and only on the rarest occasions. Coitus interruptus always gave him a severe headache and pain in the back the following day; and, besides, Mrs. P. did not trust it. But a promise is a promise, and Mr. P. tried to live up to it.

Gradually Mr. and Mrs. P. began to quarrel about one thing and another. Then he began to drink, come home late for dinner (he "had to meet several salesmen after the store closed"—after these "meetings" his breath always smelled of liquor and he didn't



feel like eating much), spent almost half his salary on drink, had very little to say to his wife, stopped taking her to the theatre and to the movies, no longer showed her customary politeness, forgot her birthdays and anniversaries, etc. In return, Mrs. P. stopped preparing elaborate dinners for him and served his meals in the kitchen. Quarrels became more and more frequent and husband and wife drifted further and further apart.

Mrs. P. is a tall, handsome woman, a few years younger than her husband, only very poorly educated, doesn't care much for music or books, and likes to go where men and women congregate and tell questionable jokes.

On his travels, Mr. P. stays in his room at night and plays solitaire, thus keeping out of the way of temptation. During the night his sleep is tormented with dreams of cohabiting with some of the women he meets in the course of his business or of seeing his wife cohabiting with other men. At home he is constantly on the look-out for evidence of his wife's infidelity. Now he notices the fountain syringe in the bathroom and wonders why; he discovers cigarette ashes in the tray when he comes home; he finds hitherto unobserved scratches on a piece of furniture; he thinks a c—m is missing, though he hadn't counted them when he purchased them); he notes with alarm that his wife is examining her chemise before she goes to bed, and so forth. Life is intolerable with him and for her.

During analysis he recites all the above facts in great detail and admits that he often indulges in fantasies of his wife's death as a release from all his woes. He *has* thought that if she were guilty of infidelity he would be justified in living a polygamous life.

In this case it was obvious that the cause of the jealousy, the alcoholism and all the other marital troubles of Mr. and Mrs. P., was the unsatisfactory sexual life. The danger of homicide and suicide was really great. Fortunately Mrs. P. had sufficient love for her husband left to agree to co-operate with me in curing him. I therefore exacted from him a promise to stop drinking (which he did forthwith), persuaded them to move from the vicinity of the man of whom Mr. P. was jealous (which they did) and adjusted their conjugal relations in a manner satisfactory to both. A perfect cure was the result.

### III.

Mr. S. is short, withered, dried-up looking, aged 56, married many years, the father of a large family living in a cheap tenement house apartment in one of the poorest sections of New



York. His wife is as old as he, just as uneducated, unromantic and unsentimental as he, and even more withered and dried-up. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. S. is so jealous of her that for months he has not gone to work but stays home to watch his wife. He cannot bear to have her out of his sight for a minute. He even suspects her with his eldest son. He is sure she has a secret understanding with the grocer, the butcher, the iceman, etc., and communicates with them by means of secret signs. If she goes to the stores to do her household shopping he accompanies her; if she talks to a visitor he keeps them constantly in his sight. His depression and his quarrels cause the family endless misery. After coitus he is better for a few hours although this is indulged in only about once a week and permitted only for the sake of peace. The man is unquestionably insane, but the children, one of whom is a school-teacher, do not want to have him committed to an insane asylum.

One day Mr. S. presents himself at my office with his gentle and patient little wife and pleads with me to hypnotize her in his presence so that he may question her about her infidelities. He has read in a newspaper that during hypnosis a person tells the truth. Another physician had hypnotized her a few weeks before this, but the doctor's technique and questions did not satisfy Mr. S. To humor him and to comply with his wife's solicitations, "for the sake of peace", I hypnotized her and let him propose the questions that I put to her. Apparently the experiment was wholly satisfactory; she answered all his questions in a manner that should and would have satisfied any sensible or sane person. After a few days, however, he returned just as dejected and jealousy-crazed as ever,—he had in the meantime extorted from her a confession that she had not really been hypnotized and had known what he had asked her and what she had answered. That ended my connection with the case.

#### IV.

A very interesting and almost baffling case of jealousy is presented by Reta C. She is only 20 years old, short, dark, petite; measures 5' 2" and weighs 110 lbs.; born a Presbyterian, married (7 months) to a tall, handsome Jew, eight years her senior. Physically there is nothing the matter with her. Had two abortions, one before marriage and one since. Though she had no orgasms till two or three months after marriage, her libido was so intense and so insistent that Reta and Mr. C. indulged in coitus almost daily and sometimes more than once a day for almost a year prior to their marriage, till finally Mr. C. managed



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

to feign illness and go to a hospital (in a remote town) for a rest. When Reta began to get orgasms she began to get jealous.

She says: "I know my husband is not a one-woman man; he turns his head to look at good-looking women in the subway, in the restaurant and in the street.— He made my acquaintance by flirting with me in the street and inviting me into his automobile. After my second ride with him he invited me into his room and induced me to lie down for a rest and then tricked me into having sexual relations with him. I can't trust him now; a few months ago I returned from a little trip out west and I found a powder puff under the sofa and a towel (with a suspicious stain) in the hamper, for which he can't account satisfactorily. Women like to look at him and his eyes just wander to where women are. I have to watch him constantly. I don't want to have children from a man whom I have to watch constantly.

"Now he never seems to want me sexually; it is true he discharges his marital duties five or six times a week, but he does so grudgingly, only to satisfy me, not because he wants it. He says I am making a 'wreck' of him and always complains of being tired. Prior to our marriage he used to boast to me of his sexual vigor; he has no difficulty in getting erections and does not suffer from premature emissions. If he made the advances I could indulge in coitus several times a day."

Mr. C. calls and says he had had an attack of gonorrhea several years ago and that the excessive sexual relations with Reta resulted in acute prostatitis and made it necessary for him to go to the hospital for several weeks for treatment (massage) and for rest; that their ante-nuptial relations were almost always unsatisfactory (c. condomatus); that he loved Reta—he doubts whether he still does so—and that she forced him into an engagement (by threatening to marry another man); that he married her to escape going to prison for violating the Mann act. Since her marriage Reta has had a 'sexless affair'—so she says—with a man she had met a year ago and of whom Mr. C. had known nothing. It was only by a little ingenious detective work that he discovered that her friend "Annie"—with whom she went to dances, to dinners, and to the theatre—was a man. He objects to having to put up with his wife's humors, her lies, her tricks, her tantrums; he can't go on keeping his head straight to the front when walking in the street or sitting in a restaurant, and he doubts his ability to satisfy her sexually. They quarrel constantly and on the slightest provocation; he occasionally slaps her in the face, often "spanks her bottom" (because she seems to be afraid of that more than of anything else) and has even knocked her down and punched her.



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

This case presents many other interesting features but we cannot go into them at present. Suffice is to say that Reta's jealousy is founded in "nymphomania," in a guilty conscience and in a feeling of inferiority. That she still loves her husband is proved, she maintains, by the fact that when she left him a few weeks ago ("for good") she stayed away only three days.

### V.

The case of Othello, as reported by Shakespeare, differs from any of the above in numerous essential characteristics and presents the psychologist with many interesting problems. Othello was a thick-lipped, dark skinned Moor, a soldier by profession, who had won distinction in many wars and become commander-in-chief of the armies of the Venetian Republic. Though he fetched his being "from men of royal siege," and notwithstanding his great value to the state, he was not held in high social esteem by the Venetians; after all, he was only a soldier and a Moor. It so happened that Desdemona, the beautiful young daughter of Senator Brabantio, one of the most powerful Dukes of Venice, whose guest Othello was, thrilled by the brave soldier's narrative of his hardships and battles, and fascinated by his vivid and artistic account of his travels, fell desperately in love with him. Moved by her tenderness and her sympathy, he reciprocated her passion. Knowing that they could never get Brabantio's consent to a marriage which the civilized world would consider unnatural, the lovers decided on an elopement with the assistance of the Moor's friend and lieutenant, the handsome Cassio who, it seems, was the only Italian to share his General's confidence. After the elopement Othello was arrested and charged, before the full senate, with having practised witchcraft in the pursuit of his evil purposes. Nowadays he would have been charged with having hypnotized Desdemona. Fortunately for the lovers, fortunately for the time being, the State of Venice just then had such great need for Othello's services, owing to a sudden declaration of war by the Turks, that punishing the Moorish general was out of the question. Within twenty-four hours after the elopement, he departed with his fleet to give battle to the Turks, and his wife, under the guardianship of one Iago, Othello's ensign, set sail for Cyprus where she was to meet her husband.

As to Othello we know that he was no longer young; he tells us that he was "declined into the vale of years (yet that's not much)," i. e., that he was middle-aged. That he lacked the arts of flattery and subtle courtship of women appears from his statement that he had not the "soft parts of conversation that cham-



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

berers have." That he was anything but handsome from a Venetian viewpoint his mirror and his sooty bosom would not let him forget. In her exculpation before the Senate, his wife said she saw her husband's visage in his mind; and the Duke could find fairness (beauty) in Othello only in his virtue (manly qualities). Whether he thought himself sexually inadequate for "the virtuous Desdemona" it is difficult to say. Shakespeare was not writing a clinical report and his history is lacking in important details. Othello does, however, tell us, in the trial scene, that "the young affects" (i. e., the passions of youth) are in him "defunct" (i. e., over); but this means only "that his passions have become tempered to the rule of judgment." (That he was *not* impotent is proved by the fact that he got married and that we have sufficient reason for suspecting him of illicit relations with Emilia, Iago's wife. That Iago had no doubts about Othello's potency is evident from his language in the first scene of the play.)

After the war was over, Iago, a malicious and envious rascal, pessimistic to the core, conceived the villainous idea of destroying Othello's happiness by making him jealous. His reasons for this dastardly purpose are not quite clear. Being himself unhappy, he could not bear to see others happy; being yoked to a woman of loose character, he was jealous of Othello's possession of "the virtuous Desdemona." Whether justly or not, he suspected both Cassio and Othello with his nightcap. But, above all, he hated Othello for having promoted Cassio to the lieutenantcy over his head. Thus actuated, he began to throw out hints to Othello that Cassio's conduct with reference to Desdemona was suspicious. These insinuations fell on fertile soil because at the time when they were made Cassio was in disfavor with his general for having got drunk while on duty and thus having precipitated a riot. One day the disgraced Cassio, while pleading with the gentle Desdemona to bring him again in her husband's favor, slunk away at the sight of Othello. Iago knew how to make the most of this innocent gesture. As usual in such cases, the jealous husband was too ashamed to say anything of his fears and suspicions to his wife.

The cunning Iago, whose profound knowledge of human nature stood him in villainous stead for his diabolical purposes, took occasion to stir up in Othello a consciousness of inferiority by suggesting to him his age, his color, etc. Nor did he fail to emphasize the fact that the Venetian women were not to be trusted,—Desdemona herself had deceived her father,—and why then might she not deceive her husband?

Othello, who was of a free and open nature, who thought men



honest who only seemed to be so, fell an easy victim to this poison. He set Iago on to watch Desdemona. The latter, knowing that to the jealous trifles light as air are confirmations strong as proofs of holy writ, managed, with the aid of his wife, to get possession of a very valuable and beautifully embroidered handkerchief that Othello had given Desdemona as his first gift and which the infuriated Moor had thrown aside one day when his solicitous wife had tried to bind his aching forehead with it. Having obtained the handkerchief, Iago lost it in Cassio's room. Then he successfully contrived to bring about a situation in which Othello saw Bianca, a common prostitute, throw the precious handkerchief—an heirloom from Othello's mother—at Cassio in a jealous quarrel in which she charged him with being unfaithful to her with the unknown owner of the handkerchief. The effect of this on Othello may easily be imagined. The more so if it is borne in mind that Othello had challenged his wife to produce the handkerchief and that instead of admitting that she had lost it she tried to turn his attention from it by pleading Cassio's cause and praising his virtues, at the same time asserting that she had the handkerchief in her possession.

Desdemona's lie about the handkerchief followed shortly after the wily Iago had told Othello of lying with Cassio one night and hearing the latter speak of Desdemona in his dream.

In sleep I heard him say, 'Sweet Desdemona,  
Let us be wary, let us hide our loves ;'  
And then, sir, would he gripe and wring my hand,  
Cry, 'O sweet creature!' and then kiss me hard,  
As if he plucked up kisses by the roots  
That grew upon my lips: then laid his leg  
Over my thigh and sigh'd and kiss'd; and then  
Cried: 'Cursed fate that gave thee to the Moor!'

The distracted Othello, crazed by jealousy now, knowing nothing of the wish-fulfilment theory of dreams, and not doubting Iago's veracity, at once concluded that in the dream Cassio was living over again a past experience. Thereafter Othello saw red and began to devise a "swift means of death for the fair devil" and her paramour. His injured pride ("False to *me*!"), the destruction of his happiness, the loss of his love, the impossibility of ever again being interested in his "occupation," the fear that Desdemona might betray more men, and the inability to bear up under the disgrace of being laughed at as a cuckold—all these combined to so enrage the Moor that nothing but the death of his wife and Cassio could bring peace to his overwrought soul, though at first he had intended only to "whistle her off, and let her down the wind, to pray at fortune" (i. e., to dismiss her and let her shift



I was sick. Mother used to favor me in many ways and had great ambitions for me. My brothers ran away from home but I always stuck to mother and gave her what I earned. Our family was always divided into cliques. When my father was forty he deserted my mother and nine children. When she couldn't stand his drunkenness and brutality any longer she put him out. She was a remarkable woman and managed to send us all through public school and I even got three years of college. We were always jealous of one another and had lot of squabbles. Jealousy is very strong in our family. My brother was always self-sacrificing and I often wonder where my sisters got their meanness and selfishness. I never could show any of my sisters any affection and used to envy Ethel's friendly relations with her brother.

Session 6. My married life is a continued succession of quarrelling and making up. She does many things that grate on me; I have to watch her constantly and tell her how to do even the simplest things. I realize, of course, that in these petty squabbles I am really giving disguised expression to my jealousy. Our friends think we get on remarkably well. I find all sorts of excuses for not going anywhere with her: at home I don't have to watch her.

I feel that I have told you everything; I'm feeling very well and am glad I came here. Yesterday I completed certain arrangements which promise to double if not treble my income. I'm thinking of renting a more expensive apartment and buying new furniture. This has been a wonderful week for me; it's the first time in two years that I have been happy for a whole week. I realize that there is nothing the matter with me and that I need not be afraid of melancholia. Till this week I have been eaten up with miserable thoughts and have envied everybody. C. is a bad city, as all travelling salesmen know; New York is saintly compared with it. Would you advise me to move to a small town? (No; a small town is no guarantee of virtue.)

I ought to tell you that during my first coitus with Ethel there was no evidence of a rupture of the hymen. That has often troubled me. (I explain to the patient that an intact hymen is no proof of virginity and that the absence of hemorrhage during the first coitus does not prove the absence of virginity.) I love children and would like Ethel to have a child; it might mean happiness to both of us. Would her two abortions predispose her to sickness if she became pregnant now? (Not if the abortion had not been complicated by infection or obstructive peritonitis; whether this occurred or not, can be determined by



a physical examination.) Would our indulgence in perverse practices tend to make our children abnormal? (No.)

I wonder what is the meaning of my dizziness. (It may mean no more than mental confusion.) I have noticed that at such times I think a million things.—Lately I've read a lot about thyroid treatment; do you think I need it? (No.) Can you give me any advice? (Don't take your wife's exposures of her body too seriously. Call her attention to her transgressions gently and persuasively. Don't treat her as if you owned her. Look on her as a good-looking girl who hasn't grown up and who is still a child in her desire for flattery. Remember that she has nothing but her body with which to beget admiration and that in her desire for men's flattering attentions she is like most good-looking women. Remember, above all, that if you scold her or quarrel with her you will be driving her into adultery. With love you will accomplish more than with force or threats.)

Session 7. Awoke depressed this morning after a dream of fighting off a dog or a cat,—it was a terrible fight. The animal I was fighting off may be a symbol for jealousy, as you suggest. I have been trying to fight off this passion. Ethel hasn't been as satisfied with me as I have with her, and that has given me a kind of inferiority feeling. If she went with another man it would hurt my pride. Do you think I could go back and live peacefully with her? (Yes, if you will be ruled by reason and make allowances for your wife's narcissism.) If I can't I want to break it up altogether. Do you think she was guilty of infidelity? (I have no reason for thinking so.) Since my coming here I have had no uneasiness in the street.

To depreciate the men Ethel knew, I used to lie about them to her and used to tell her about their philanderings. I did this so that she would not think that they were paying attentions to her only. But she was on to me and would find things for which to praise them. That always made me jealous. At times I'm sure she purposely makes me jealous, especially if I neglect her. At times she flirts with men just to see if she can still get admiration,—she has no other interests; all she talks of is her shape, her weight and her food; sensible talk bores her to death. She doesn't like to have visitors because they scratch the mahogany furniture and she doesn't like to go among sensible people because there she is only a wallflower. All she wants is diversion. It's very difficult for me to entertain her because she can't keep her mind on anything; she can't even concentrate on a game of cards.

A big city like New York would furnish us sufficient diver-



conduct, not by injuring her physically. I have thought of watching her, of checking up her telephone calls, etc. I often resolved not to be jealous but it never lasts longer than three or four days. She talks pleasantly to clerks in the stores, to the iceman, the milkman, and I get furious. At times she has threatened to leave me, and at such times I told her, that I was satisfied to have her go; but she stayed.

Before my marriage I was very easily attracted to women, going from one to the other easily. I feel that I have given up a lot in getting married; now I can't go about or do as I please. In yielding to her wish to live in C., I have given up my New York friends and my family. At times I wonder if marriage is worth it and at such times my thoughts are very bitter. When Ethel and I are good friends I love married life.

When I'm away from her I think only of what she is doing. I would prefer to live in New York because I would have my friends and my family and Ethel would not be near the men she had known before her marriage. She is an easy liar and lies even about trifles, probably to save me from getting into a temper.

At times it has occurred to me that Ethel would be glad if I died but I never have any fantasies of her death. I have never struck her or even thought of it. I never was mischievous and never played practical jokes; I was always chicken-hearted about such things. It's a curious thing but I love her more when away from her than when with her. I have often gone away with the intention of not seeing her for a week but returned home the next day.

I didn't realize how jealous I am until we began to talk of it here, and now it seems I can talk of nothing else. When we quarrel she says derogatory things about me and speaks of other men who have larger incomes; but when we make up she takes it all back again. She has a much better home now than she had before she was married. I had a very queer dream last night: my head had been cut off and my body had been laid in another room for future use; but I continued to live; when I went to get my body I found it was all mussed up as if someone had stepped on it. That's all I can recall of it. I have many crazy dreams; this one recalls nothing to me and is very remote from anything I can think of. It suggests a spiritualistic idea: the separation of the head, i. e., the mind, from the body. That reminds me that you said that my bodily symptoms are the results of what goes on in my mind. The body being mussed up, must, therefore, stand for my body mussed up by my thoughts. The idea of



decapitation doesn't suggest anything to me. Oh, yes you must be right in thinking that here is a reference to what you told me two days ago about psychanalysis being like the axe in Sir Walter Raleigh's story: before he was beheaded he took up the axe and said. "This is a sharp medicine, but it cures all diseases." The dream must mean, then, that I expect this treatment to cure me, and that I realize the mental origin of my symptoms.

I have been very happy the last few days, for I think I'm getting cured. Yesterday afternoon your quotation from Sir Walter came to my mind as I was sitting down to write my wife a letter apologizing to her and her family. Here is a curious coincidence. Two nights ago I happened to be with one of my favorite nephews, a little boy two and a half years old, who says on all occasions "I'll cut your head off." It's strange, too, that in the dream the leg was out of order; that night my leg had been numb for a short time, but it hasn't bothered me since, though I have walked around a lot. At first my right foot used to get numb, but never the right leg; of late it has been only the left leg and foot. I still indulge in a great many sexual fantasies except when I'm not feeling well. You may be right in thinking that my being ill keeps me going straight; I know it keeps me from indulging myself. If I want Ethel to go straight I must do so. When I feel well I think of sex; when I'm ill I want to get under cover.

Session 5. Last night I had a queer dream about my favorite sister. (I omit this dream and the associations to it, retaining only what I consider significant in the present connection.) This sister is the only one who knows of my troubles with my wife, but I think I made a mistake to take her into my confidence; she is not sufficiently broad-minded to see Ethel's side of the case; she advised me to leave Ethel. She and her husband quarrel occasionally but on the whole they get along pretty well. There is a strain of nervousness in my whole family. My mother's brother is a nervous wreck. One of my brothers is very jealous of his wife though she is very fat and ungainly. He also suffers from nervous indigestion. In our childhood we were all dreadfully jealous of one another. We were always on the alert to see that mother didn't play favorites. We were all the more jealous because we were very poor. I was my mother's pet because I used to take pride in earning money after school hours and bringing it home. One day my mother gave me two cents to buy a rubber ball on a rubber string. That was a fortune to me. That night I lay awake all night thinking of my mother's kindness to me and I cried so that they thought



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

girl with whom I was. Now I blame my wife if I see anything wrong, because I have no confidence in her; she is too free and easygoing with people. Though we have quarrelled a great deal about this, she shows no disposition to change. If she ever called a man down for taking liberties with her I would have more confidence in her; she says she doesn't take these things seriously.

I have no doubts about my ability to satisfy her, either socially, intellectually, financially or sexually. She takes absolutely no interest in anything, never reads a book or a magazine, and gets bored when people discuss the topics of the day or scientific or literary subjects. And yet she is by no means stupid, for she was a good stenographer before we were married.

She once told me she had been out with some fellow before our marriage and I had an inward brainstorm but said nothing. but I wondered what had happened between them. I don't like her to meet any of the men she had known before our marriage. She had told me of wild parties she had been to as a girl, where they drank, danced, petted each other, and that some of the girls even had intercourse, but that she had done nothing. Of course, I was not abstinent before my marriage, but since then I had intercourse with another woman for the first time half a year ago, and then only because Ethel and I were at swords' points and I was very despondent. I regretted it when it was over. We are both quick-tempered and our quarrels are tempestuous affairs; her temper is getting worse daily. I lapsed again two months ago, after I had been away from home for ten days.

Ethel is passionate only during coitus. She loves to excite men's passions. She once told me how smart she was to let fellows make love to her and get excited and then leave them in the lurch. She never makes sexual advances to me. Of late she is very nervous; she gets upset about trifles and sulks for hours. I know that we are drifting wide apart. I'd like to call it all closed; lately I've even thought of a separation or a divorce,—it would be best for both of us. A year ago I made her an offer of a temporary separation during which I would support her as heretofore, but she refused because of what people would think. If I broach the subject of divorce to her she says that I want to get rid of her. I do not think that she can modify her behavior; she is not strong-willed and I fear that she will not be able to resist temptation. I know men and I know that very few will fail to take advantage of such a woman as Ethel.

I would have greater confidence in her if I did not know the things she had done before her marriage. Because she yielded to me I doubt whether she resisted the others. And when I woke



her and told her of the *emissio in vaginam* she didn't seem to be at all disturbed though I was greatly worried. She woke her room mate who was sleeping in another room and told her what had happened; this girl then advised her to douche. Neither of them seemed to take the matter seriously.

Before my marriage I approved of the single standard, but my wife's conduct has changed all this. When she asks if I ever have anything to do with other women I say I do not. She is constantly telling me she loves me and never passes by me without giving me a pet or putting her arm around me or kissing me. Recently she even showed signs of jealousy when I told her, falsely, that I had taken a girl to the theatre.

Sometimes I get sick in the street even when I'm with her, but I am sure it is not because she looks at passing men, but I watch her to see if she looks at the men. I don't like her to know that I'm watching her, but she knows. Life must be as miserable for her as it is for me. I shun the company of women because I don't want to give Ethel an excuse for flirting. I do not think that I would be happy if I were divorced, for I find that I cannot get Ethel out of my mind; when I compare her with other women none seems to be as nice as she. I don't think other men could resist her form and her sexual behavior. I admire her beautiful red hair and her beauty as she lies in bed.

I began to indulge in coitus when I was fourteen. I tried to keep away from good girls because my mother had brought me up to respect women, and nice girls always made me think of my sisters. I used to have a great many sexual dreams; these dreams were always of women I didn't know, the children of my mind, not prostitutes, and in most of these dreams I did nothing but look at the women. I didn't object to smutty jokes if they were clever; I enjoyed reading the Decameron and such things. When I was sixteen I came across a set of obscene pictures and bought them. At the age of twelve a school-fellow introduced me to the art of masturbation. The thought of homosexual or perverse practices disgust me. While masturbating, I indulged in fantasies of coitus. I continued this practice till I was eighteen because coitus with prostitutes was not as pleasurable as these fantasies.

Session 4. I'm feeling fine the last three days and my mind is perfectly clear. Two nights ago I went to a party and had a fine time, notwithstanding the big crowd, and had only one attack of pain about the heart which passed away in a few minutes.

Yes, I have had thoughts of revenge by exposing my wife's



## JEALOUSY, WITH REPORTS OF CASES—TANNENBAUM

probably on account of my mental condition . . . I'm suspicious of her although I have no concrete reason for being so. The truth is, I'm very jealous of her though at times I know that my jealousy is absurd. I had known her only two weeks when I married her; it was a case of love at first sight. I proposed to her the second time I saw her.

A friend of mine who introduced me to her had praised her to the skies and told me that he had spent a night with her but without having had relations with her. I'm sure he told the truth. When I called on her I found her to be as beautiful and charming as my friend had described her. We had some drinks and then went to bed. I had all my clothes on. She was menstruating at the time, so nothing happened. A few days later I called again; this time we did have coitus although she slept through it all and seemed not to know what had happened until I woke her. I was troubled and conscience-stricken and afraid that she might be pregnant. The next day I proposed to her and she accepted me. Then I had to go away on a trip for a week during which time I worried a great deal about her and pictured her going wrong if I didn't marry her and I'd be to blame for her fall. I had some misgivings about marrying her but decided to go through with it and do my best to be happy. I knew that she had been out a lot with men and was intoxicated with the gay life of C. She had been living away from her family and had consequently enjoyed a great deal of freedom.

With my marriage my views became changed. I wanted new friends and a new kind of life. I took my marriage seriously and did not look at another woman for nine or ten months. Then Ethel—my wife—became pregnant; but she didn't want to have a child and had an abortion done, against my will. It seemed to me that she didn't love me and that she did not take marriage seriously. By this time I had noticed, with resentment, that she allowed men to be familiar with her, let them pet her and even kiss her, and showed too much leg in public. All this cut me like a whip; I had been very scrupulous not to look at other women. We have had frequent arguments about this sort of thing. Even during the first week of our married life I saw her wrapped in another fellow's arms in our house and kissing each other. Since then I don't like to invite any of our friends to our home.

If she tells me of meeting other men, or if she praises them, it sets me on fire. My jealousy has caused a split between me and her family. I had a quarrel with them when I saw her sister's husband take liberties with her; he neglected his own wife



but played a lot with mine. Ethel has an enticing figure and attracts men; she is twenty-five years old, is five feet seven inches tall and is a very pretty blonde. She has a free and easy disposition and can't call a man down if he tries anything. That's why I have no confidence in her.

She was pregnant again a year and a half ago and again submitted to an abortion. We do not practice contraception. Ethel is very libidinous and as I'm home about three days a week we have coitus about five times a week, unless we have been quarreling. Ethel craves for cunnilingus but I very rarely gratify her; I have done so about five times since I'm married. My refusal to gratify her in this may cause much of our unhappiness. She has occasionally practiced fellatio, partially or completely. Usually we do these things only partially and merely as a preliminary to coitus. All this has caused no loss of respect for each other and I think I still love her.

We quarrel about money matters too. She loves to go out, to the movies and to the theatre. When I'm out with her anywhere I keep watching her to see whether she is looking at the men; when she meets good-looking men she raves about them to me and analyzes their features. If she accompanied me on my travels I would feel better; when I'm away from her I imagine all sorts of things happening at home. Now I never go on trips that last longer than three days because I feel better when I'm at home. She likes night life and wants me to take her out a good deal, and because I don't do so we quarrel. Because I'm uncomfortable in her presence in public places, I prefer to stay home and let her go out with a girl friend. I have at times suspected her with different men but I always dismiss these thoughts for lack of evidence. She does such funny things! She exposes her figure on the slightest provocation and shows not the slightest modesty in the presence of her mother, her sisters or myself. My mother taught us all to be very modest; she once beat one of my sisters for coming in the living room in a kimono. In the summer months Ethel loves to wear the thinnest garments and goes out without an underskirt; when she does her morning's shopping she is always too scantily clothed. At night she never thinks of pulling the shades down when she undresses. When I walk along the street I think of these things and that probably accounts for my getting sick in the street. This never occurred to me before. Before my marriage I never had these symptoms.

Session 3. I would be jealous of Ethel even if she were not good looking, just because she is my wife. Before I was married I once beat up a fellow because he looked in a wrong way at the



berers have." That he was anything but handsome from a Venetian viewpoint his mirror and his sooty bosom would not let him forget. In her exculpation before the Senate, his wife said she saw her husband's visage in his mind; and the Duke could find fairness (beauty) in Othello only in his virtue (manly qualities). Whether he thought himself sexually inadequate for "the virtuous Desdemona" it is difficult to say. Shakespeare was not writing a clinical report and his history is lacking in important details. Othello does, however, tell us, in the trial scene, that "the young affects" (i. e., the passions of youth) are in him "defunct" (i. e., over); but this means only "that his passions have become tempered to the rule of judgment." (That he was *not* impotent is proved by the fact that he got married and that we have sufficient reason for suspecting him of illicit relations with Emilia, Iago's wife. That Iago had no doubts about Othello's potency is evident from his language in the first scene of the play.)

After the war was over, Iago, a malicious and envious rascal, pessimistic to the core, conceived the villainous idea of destroying Othello's happiness by making him jealous. His reasons for this dastardly purpose are not quite clear. Being himself unhappy, he could not bear to see others happy; being yoked to a woman of loose character, he was jealous of Othello's possession of "the virtuous Desdemona." Whether justly or not, he suspected both Cassio and Othello with his nightcap. But, above all, he hated Othello for having promoted Cassio to the lieutenantcy over his head. Thus actuated, he began to throw out hints to Othello that Cassio's conduct with reference to Desdemona was suspicious. These insinuations fell on fertile soil because at the time when they were made Cassio was in disfavor with his general for having got drunk while on duty and thus having precipitated a riot. One day the disgraced Cassio, while pleading with the gentle Desdemona to bring him again in her husband's favor, slunk away at the sight of Othello. Iago knew how to make the most of this innocent gesture. As usual in such cases, the jealous husband was too ashamed to say anything of his fears and suspicions to his wife.

The cunning Iago, whose profound knowledge of human nature stood him in villainous stead for his diabolical purposes, took occasion to stir up in Othello a consciousness of inferiority by suggesting to him his age, his color, etc. Nor did he fail to emphasize the fact that the Venetian women were not to be trusted,—Desdemona herself had deceived her father,—and why then might she not deceive her husband?

Othello, who was of a free and open nature, who thought men



honest who only seemed to be so, fell an easy victim to this poison. He set Iago on to watch Desdemona. The latter, knowing that to the jealous trifles light as air are confirmations strong as proofs of holy writ, managed, with the aid of his wife, to get possession of a very valuable and beautifully embroidered handkerchief that Othello had given Desdemona as his first gift and which the infuriated Moor had thrown aside one day when his solicitous wife had tried to bind his aching forehead with it. Having obtained the handkerchief, Iago lost it in Cassio's room. Then he successfully contrived to bring about a situation in which Othello saw Bianca, a common prostitute, throw the precious handkerchief—an heirloom from Othello's mother—at Cassio in a jealous quarrel in which she charged him with being unfaithful to her with the unknown owner of the handkerchief. The effect of this on Othello may easily be imagined. The more so if it is borne in mind that Othello had challenged his wife to produce the handkerchief and that instead of admitting that she had lost it she tried to turn his attention from it by pleading Cassio's cause and praising his virtues, at the same time asserting that she had the handkerchief in her possession.

Desdemona's lie about the handkerchief followed shortly after the wily Iago had told Othello of lying with Cassio one night and hearing the latter speak of Desdemona in his dream.

In sleep I heard him say, 'Sweet Desdemona,  
 Let us be wary, let us hide our loves ;'  
 And then, sir, would he gripe and wring my hand,  
 Cry, 'O sweet creature!' and then kiss me hard,  
 As if he plucked up kisses by the roots  
 That grew upon my lips: then laid his leg  
 Over my thigh and sigh'd and kiss'd; and then  
 Cried: 'Cursed fate that gave thee to the Moor!'

The distracted Othello, crazed by jealousy now, knowing nothing of the wish-fulfilment theory of dreams, and not doubting Iago's veracity, at once concluded that in the dream Cassio was living over again a past experience. Thereafter Othello saw red and began to devise a "swift means of death for the fair devil" and her paramour. His injured pride ("False to *me*!"), the destruction of his happiness, the loss of his love, the impossibility of ever again being interested in his "occupation," the fear that Desdemona might betray more men, and the inability to bear up under the disgrace of being laughed at as a cuckold—all these combined to so enrage the Moor that nothing but the death of his wife and Cassio could bring peace to his overwrought soul, though at first he had intended only to "whistle her off, and let her down the wind, to pray at fortune" (i. e., to dismiss her and let her shift



to feign illness and go to a hospital (in a remote town) for a rest. When Reta began to get orgasms she began to get jealous.

She says: "I know my husband is not a one-woman man; he turns his head to look at good-looking women in the subway, in the restaurant and in the street.— He made my acquaintance by flirting with me in the street and inviting me into his automobile. After my second ride with him he invited me into his room and induced me to lie down for a rest and then tricked me into having sexual relations with him. I can't trust him now; a few months ago I returned from a little trip out west and I found a powder puff under the sofa and a towel (with a suspicious stain) in the hamper, for which he can't account satisfactorily. Women like to look at him and his eyes just wander to where women are. I have to watch him constantly. I don't want to have children from a man whom I have to watch constantly.

"Now he never seems to want me sexually; it is true he discharges his marital duties five or six times a week, but he does so grudgingly, only to satisfy me, not because he wants it. He says I am making a 'wreck' of him and always complains of being tired. Prior to our marriage he used to boast to me of his sexual vigor; he has no difficulty in getting erections and does not suffer from premature emissions. If he made the advances I could indulge in coitus several times a day."

Mr. C. calls and says he had had an attack of gonorrhea several years ago and that the excessive sexual relations with Reta resulted in acute prostatitis and made it necessary for him to go to the hospital for several weeks for treatment (massage) and for rest; that their ante-nuptial relations were almost always unsatisfactory (c. condomatus); that he loved Reta—he doubts whether he still does so—and that she forced him into an engagement (by threatening to marry another man); that he married her to escape going to prison for violating the Mann act. Since her marriage Reta has had a 'sexless affair'—so she says—with a man she had met a year ago and of whom Mr. C. had known nothing. It was only by a little ingenious detective work that he discovered that her friend "Annie"—with whom she went to dances, to dinners, and to the theatre—was a man. He objects to having to put up with his wife's humors, her lies, her tricks, her tantrums; he can't go on keeping his head straight to the front when walking in the street or sitting in a restaurant, and he doubts his ability to satisfy her sexually. They quarrel constantly and on the slightest provocation; he occasionally slaps her in the face, often "spanks her bottom" (because she seems to be afraid of that more than of anything else) and has even knocked her down and punched her.



This case presents many other interesting features but we cannot go into them at present. Suffice is to say that Reta's jealousy is founded in "nymphomania," in a guilty conscience and in a feeling of inferiority. That she still loves her husband is proved, she maintains, by the fact that when she left him a few weeks ago ("for good") she stayed away only three days.

## V.

The case of Othello, as reported by Shakespeare, differs from any of the above in numerous essential characteristics and presents the psychologist with many interesting problems. Othello was a thick-lipped, dark skinned Moor, a soldier by profession, who had won distinction in many wars and become commander-in-chief of the armies of the Venetian Republic. Though he fetched his being "from men of royal siege," and notwithstanding his great value to the state, he was not held in high social esteem by the Venetians; after all, he was only a soldier and a Moor. It so happened that Desdemona, the beautiful young daughter of Senator Brabantio, one of the most powerful Dukes of Venice, whose guest Othello was, thrilled by the brave soldier's narrative of his hardships and battles, and fascinated by his vivid and artistic account of his travels, fell desperately in love with him. Moved by her tenderness and her sympathy, he reciprocated her passion. Knowing that they could never get Brabantio's consent to a marriage which the civilized world would consider unnatural, the lovers decided on an elopement with the assistance of the Moor's friend and lieutenant, the handsome Cassio who, it seems, was the only Italian to share his General's confidence. After the elopement Othello was arrested and charged, before the full senate, with having practised witchcraft in the pursuit of his evil purposes. Nowadays he would have been charged with having hypnotized Desdemona. Fortunately for the lovers, fortunately for the time being, the State of Venice just then had such great need for Othello's services, owing to a sudden declaration of war by the Turks, that punishing the Moorish general was out of the question. Within twenty-four hours after the elopement, he departed with his fleet to give battle to the Turks, and his wife, under the guardianship of one Iago, Othello's ensign, set sail for Cyprus where she was to meet her husband.

As to Othello we know that he was no longer young; he tells us that he was "declined into the vale of years (yet that's not much)," i. e., that he was middle-aged. That he lacked the arts of flattery and subtle courtship of women appears from his statement that he had not the "soft parts of conversation that cham-



feel like eating much), spent almost half his salary on drink, had very little to say to his wife, stopped taking her to the theatre and to the movies, no longer showed her customary politeness, forgot her birthdays and anniversaries, etc. In return, Mrs. P. stopped preparing elaborate dinners for him and served his meals in the kitchen. Quarrels became more and more frequent and husband and wife drifted further and further apart.

Mrs. P. is a tall, handsome woman, a few years younger than her husband, only very poorly educated, doesn't care much for music or books, and likes to go where men and women congregate and tell questionable jokes.

On his travels, Mr. P. stays in his room at night and plays solitaire, thus keeping out of the way of temptation. During the night his sleep is tormented with dreams of cohabiting with some of the women he meets in the course of his business or of seeing his wife cohabiting with other men. At home he is constantly on the look-out for evidence of his wife's infidelity. Now he notices the fountain syringe in the bathroom and wonders why; he discovers cigarette ashes in the tray when he comes home; he finds hitherto unobserved scratches on a piece of furniture; he thinks a c—m is missing, though he hadn't counted them when he purchased them); he notes with alarm that his wife is examining her chemise before she goes to bed, and so forth. Life is intolerable with him and for her.

During analysis he recites all the above facts in great detail and admits that he often indulges in fantasies of his wife's death as a release from all his woes. He *has* thought that if she were guilty of infidelity he would be justified in living a polygamous life.

In this case it was obvious that the cause of the jealousy, the alcoholism and all the other marital troubles of Mr. and Mrs. P., was the unsatisfactory sexual life. The danger of homicide and suicide was really great. Fortunately Mrs. P. had sufficient love for her husband left to agree to co-operate with me in curing him. I therefore exacted from him a promise to stop drinking (which he did forthwith), persuaded them to move from the vicinity of the man of whom Mr. P. was jealous (which they did) and adjusted their conjugal relations in a manner satisfactory to both. A perfect cure was the result.

### III.

Mr. S. is short, withered, dried-up looking, aged 56, married many years, the father of a large family living in a cheap tenement house apartment in one of the poorest sections of New



York. His wife is as old as he, just as uneducated, unromantic and unsentimental as he, and even more withered and dried-up. Notwithstanding all this, Mr. S. is so jealous of her that for months he has not gone to work but stays home to watch his wife. He cannot bear to have her out of his sight for a minute. He even suspects her with his eldest son. He is sure she has a secret understanding with the grocer, the butcher, the iceman, etc., and communicates with them by means of secret signs. If she goes to the stores to do her household shopping he accompanies her; if she talks to a visitor he keeps them constantly in his sight. His depression and his quarrels cause the family endless misery. After coitus he is better for a few hours although this is indulged in only about once a week and permitted only for the sake of peace. The man is unquestionably insane, but the children, one of whom is a school-teacher, do not want to have him committed to an insane asylum.

One day Mr. S. presents himself at my office with his gentle and patient little wife and pleads with me to hypnotize her in his presence so that he may question her about her infidelities. He has read in a newspaper that during hypnosis a person tells the truth. Another physician had hypnotized her a few weeks before this, but the doctor's technique and questions did not satisfy Mr. S. To humor him and to comply with his wife's solicitations, "for the sake of peace", I hypnotized her and let him propose the questions that I put to her. Apparently the experiment was wholly satisfactory; she answered all his questions in a manner that should and would have satisfied any sensible or sane person. After a few days, however, he returned just as dejected and jealousy-crazed as ever,—he had in the meantime extorted from her a confession that she had not really been hypnotized and had known what he had asked her and what she had answered. That ended my connection with the case.

#### IV.

A very interesting and almost baffling case of jealousy is presented by Reta C. She is only 20 years old, short, dark, petite; measures 5' 2" and weighs 110 lbs.; born a Presbyterian, married (7 months) to a tall, handsome Jew, eight years her senior. Physically there is nothing the matter with her. Had two abortions, one before marriage and one since. Though she had no orgasms till two or three months after marriage, her libido was so intense and so insistent that Reta and Mr. C. indulged in coitus almost daily and sometimes more than once a day for almost a year prior to their marriage, till finally Mr. C. managed



sion but it might also be a means of enabling her to get away with things. I often picture her as going down the line and becoming an outcast. My work doesn't interest her; when I come back from my trips she never shows any curiosity about what or how I had been doing. When she tells me anything I show my interest by asking a lot of questions, and she resents that for she thinks I'm trying to catch her in a lie. I used to be very romantic and sentimental and indulged in fantasies of being married to a wonderful girl; but my marriage is anything but like my dreams. I wonder if her demonstrations of affection are put on.

She calls everybody by pet names; everybody is "Honey" to her. I must admit that her bringing-up was different from mine, her sisters also are lavish in the use of terms of endearment; they discuss all matters very frankly. Ethel has a nice word and a smile for everybody. When I go back home I'll have to take all these things into consideration and try to get Ethel interested in the things that interest me.

Session 8. I'm beginning to realize that a great deal of my nervousness was a sort of excuse for staying home with Ethel; probably that's why I didn't like to go to places where I'd meet groups of people. I don't know how to act when I'm with people who do not interest me. When I wake in the morning I feel sluggish and have no pep and just sit around doing nothing. I don't get enough exercise. (You must remedy this).

I feel that I have told you my whole story and I think that I'll be able to manage Ethel; if I'm nice to her I can do a great deal with her. When we got married she was very extravagant but now that she knows how I stand financially she is economical. After all, she is not a dumbbell and I think I can get her interested in music (she plays the piano a little) and in the theatre. I must learn to keep my temper and not be tyrannical. Do you think it would be advisable for us to move to New York? (Yes). I'm leaving for C. this afternoon and shall keep you informed as to how we get on.

(The above case is reported not as showing that jealousy can be cured by psychoanalysis — scientific "confession" combined with scientific explanation of symptoms — but as showing how neurotic mental and physical manifestations may result from emotional disturbances consequent upon conditions with which the individual is, for various reasons, unequal to cope satisfactorily. Mr. C's jealousy is sufficiently well founded and he did not know what to do about his wife's conduct; he is torn between conflicting desires — and the result is neurosis. Unless his



wife's behavior will change — as a result of analysis or something more drastic—he will continue to be jealous but he will be free from the symptoms that brought him to me).

## II.

A somewhat different type of jealousy is presented by the following case (referred to me some six years ago by Dr. Laase). Mr. P., fairly well-educated Swiss, aged 42, tall, handsome, healthy looking, stockily built and well groomed; haggard and worried, restless and uneasy; gives impression of neatness and cleanness; looks prosperous; travelling salesman; lives in New York but spends much of his time on the road, several weeks at a time. For several months past has been surly, irritable, quarrelsome, morose, impatient, and jealous. Jealous outbursts getting more frequent, more noisy, and more unendurable. Sleeps very poorly, awakes about 4.30 every morning with a severe headache and can't fall asleep again; is very amorous and demonstrative on awaking and can be pacified by his wife only by constant asseverations of her love for him. At times he admits that he knows his suspicions are groundless and his jealousy absurd; at other times he is absolutely convinced of his wife's guilt and threatens to kill her and himself. His jealousy centers especially on one man, a neighbor, whom he has known many years and who often plays cards with him in his home but whom he has never liked because of his free and easy manner with women and his fondness for telling smutty jokes. Mr. P., on the contrary, has the highest respect for women, never tells a vulgar joke, has never had intercourse with any woman but his wife, and has never desired extra-marital sexual relations. He knows nothing of perversions or of inversion.

Mr. and Mrs. P. have been married seventeen years and they have only one child, a son of sixteen. Mrs. P.'s delivery was a difficult one and the child had to be taken with forceps. When Mr. P. saw how ill his wife was he promised her never to impregnate her again. The promise was easily made but not so easy to keep. Coitus condomatus was so repugnant to his esthetic sensibilities that Mr. P. refused to resort to it and was compelled to do so with the utmost reluctance and only on the rarest occasions. Coitus interruptus always gave him a severe headache and pain in the back the following day; and, besides, Mrs. P. did not trust it. But a promise is a promise, and Mr. P. tried to live up to it.

Gradually Mr. and Mrs. P. began to quarrel about one thing and another. Then he began to drink, come home late for dinner (he "had to meet several salesmen after the store closed"—after these "meetings" his breath always smelled of liquor and he didn't



## SEXUAL VIGOR—NYSTROM

certainly are older people, some being from 120 to 140 years old, but such instances are comparatively very rare, and prove nothing for the possibility of the average to remain healthy and active for more than one hundred years. As a rule, with the onset of old age, man feels less vigorous and the reserve forces of the body are no longer sufficient for normal achievements. However, quite a few men are vigorous between 70 and 80, and more are healthy and chipper after 60 and able to do more and better work than others between 40 and 50. As on the other hand, younger weaklings and impotents are biographically and physiologically in their dotage, we are justified in maintaining that "age" is relative.

Erotic feelings and sexual power in older men are partly due to a congenitally strong constitution, partly to moderation in their sexual life in their younger years.

In the past, many physicians, proceeding from wrong ideas regarding the sexual life of older men, warned against intercourse after 50 or 60 years. According to my experience, no other rule can be laid down for sexual intercourse during old age but "moderation!"—the same as holds true for younger men. And if an older man has sexual feelings he does well to have intercourse, for it will keep him healthy and strong. In general we may say that the sexual desire may be regarded as an indicator of a man's health.

In contrast to certain older authorities, who advised against sexual intercourse for older men, Gyurkovechky ("Pathology and Therapy of Male Impotence," 1897) emphasizes that they run no risk at all if they satisfy a real sexual desire, and that coitus may be even salubrious for older persons, as it increases the stimulation of the metabolism, quickens the mind and keeps up the good humor, so rarely found in the old, and that sex relations may be truly counted amongst the means for the prolongation of life. The occasional case of an elderly newly wed man dying during or after coitus proves nothing, for we witness daily the sudden or slow death of persons who thought neither of marriage nor sexual intercourse, while on the other hand, we encounter cases of old men who at the side of a young spouse become young again and live to a ripe old age. Forsooth, these men who in the possession of health and vigor have preserved their sexual power, have better prospects for living long than others who are condemned to involuntary continence.

The same results of continence as seen in younger may be observed in older men: headache, heaviness in the back of the head, pains in the testicles, restlessness, general malaise, etc. It



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

is quite probable that prostatitis occurring in older men is due to the cessation of the sexual activities after the death of the wife.

Metschnikoff, Hirth and other authorities, who regard the prolongation of life as an hygienic ideal, consider the maintenance of the sexual power, which is by no means an utopia, as an effective means to that end.

Autopsies performed by Duplays and Dieu revealed the presence of well developed spermatozoa in octogenarians. Carper, in his "Physiology," tells us that spermatozoa were found in the vesicles of a man who died at 95.

There are families whose members are distinguished by longevity and sexual vigor at an advanced age. I observed several such cases in my own practice.

A government official, aged 62, widower for the last half year, consulted me on account of his strong libido, which caused him suffering and inconvenience, because he was now condemned to a continent life. He often had pollutions and daily erections, which several times had driven him to masturbation.

A scholar, aged 65, who owing to the sickness of his wife was sometimes forced to be continent for three or four weeks, had severe pains in his testicles, which were enlarged, so that he was hardly able to walk. The administration of bromide of potassium and opium produced no effects and he got no relief from his pains before he had intercourse.

A workingman, aged 70, widower for the last twenty years and father of six children, stated that at least once a week he felt desire for sexual intercourse and that he had continually erections and pollutions. For this reason he entered into a liaison with his housekeeper.

An octogenarian had pollutions once a month since the death of his wife, which occurred four years ago. Till then he had lived in a happy marriage for 47 years and cohabited regularly.

I was acquainted with a scientist who had always enjoyed good health and at the age of 62, being a widower, fell in love with a young lady whom he finally married. The marriage was quite harmonious, he cohabited several times a month till he was 80, when I lost sight of him. He stated he was never fatigued the day following intercourse, but on the contrary, that he felt cheerful and refreshed.

This reminds me of Goethe's love-life. Love was as necessary to him as bread, and the best stimulant for his creative work; at the age of seventy-four he was seized with a violent passion for the 18-year old Ulrika von Levetzow and enjoyed at her side a second youth in vigor and cheerfulness. Discussing one day



## SEXUAL VIGOR—NYSTROM

men who at an advanced age showed a remarkable energy, Goethe said: "Such men I call wonderful and exceptional natures; they experience a second puberty, while others are young only once."

I cite a few more instances of sexual vigor in old men: Hufeland tells us of men who married at the age of 100 and 112 years—"and not only pro forma" ("Makrobiotik," 1823).

In "Journal de Medicine" (1759), we read of a 96-year old man who for many years cohabited with his 93-year old wife three times every night without any detriments to his health.

The Englishman Thomas Parr, who died in the year 1635, far beyond 100 years (however, not at the age of 152, as legends tell), married at the age of 80 and begot two children. At the age of 105 he was punished for being the father of an illegitimate child. [I am tired of the example of Thomas Parr. W.J.R.]

The Norwegian Drakenberg, a seafaring man, who died in 1772, at the age of 146 years, [sure?] at Copenhagen, married at the age of 111 years. Even during the latter years of his life he gave proofs of an extraordinary sexual vigor.

King Vladislav of Poland became a father at the age of ninety.

Duke L. F. de Richelieu, minister of State under Louis XV and Louis XVI, was extremely erotic. He always enjoyed the best of health, was never sick, but active till he died at the age of 92 (1788). At the age of 84, he married for the third time.

The eminent Swedish physician and scientist Urban Hjarne, who died in 1724, at the age of 83, was married thrice, the last time at the age of 62. From his three wives he had 25 children. Of these, nine were born in his last marriage, the youngest son, when the father was 74 years old. That the latter, the Royal Councillor Gustave Hjarne, had inherited a strong constitution, is evident by the fact that he reached the ripe old age of 90 years.



(Translated for The Journal of Sexology and Psychoanalysis)

## SUICIDE AND SEXUALITY

By DR. MAX MARCUSE\*

The extraordinarily large number of suicides committed during the period of puberty, and the numerous suicides and double-suicides on account of confessed or otherwise evident unrequited love, are suggestive of a connection between suicide and sexuality. To both groups belong suicides committed on account of an "incurable disease" (as a rule, syphilis), and suicides owing to "an unknown cause" (syphilis or homosexuality). Furthermore, suicide committed by females is quite frequently coincident with menstruation and the generative phases, such as pregnancy, puerperium, lactation, and the climacterium, the latter being sometimes also significant in suicides of males. Beyond all these more or less manifest connections, a considerable percentage of suicides may be in one way or the other motivated by other sexual factors, for "the suicidal idea, like the neuroses, arises under the same constellations" (A. Adler), that is to say, essentially under the pressure of sexual and erotic conflicts.

The sexual root of suicides committed during puberty is usually camouflaged by the designation of "suicide of school children"; in the majority of cases, the terrors of the examination, etc., in short, "the school anxiety," appears by way of "transference" as the cause, in the place of the real *causa movens* of the suicidal act, namely, sex-anxiety. This "transference" of the affect of fear from the sexual sphere to the school is quite a common psychic process and quickened by the fact that for the pupil, the school being naturally the most proximate object of his fear, there is easily formed a close connection between the ideas regarding the passing of an examination, the solution of a lesson, etc., on the one hand, and sexual affects on the other.

Instead of ventilating the mechanism as exemplified by the psychoanalysts ("to lay hands on one self"; "the wish father was dead"; "act of revenge," etc.), or the infantile suicides, occurring between the third and fourth years of life, and probably often due to infantile-erotic conflicts—for these things are unprovable—we begin with the discussion of suicides committed by school-children, and their unquestionable connection with puberty and masturbation, of which the former provides the basis for the psychic disturbances, while the latter has a double and apparently self-contradictory significance. For masturbation not only on account of being practical, but because it is *not more* practised, may lead to that fear out of which the young psyche finds no other means of escape but by voluntary death. In such cases the suicide is as a rule the victim of a wrong "enlightenment" which depicts

---

\*Zeitschrift f. Sexualwissenschaft, October, 1922.



the most frightful consequences of "this vice." The young persons thus terrorized escape from the putative dangers threatening them into death. To these victims belong also those who break down under the burden of ethical and religious scruples, as, e. g., that sixteen year old masturbator who wanted "to end it all," because he had broken his word of honor given to a captain of the boy scouts, promising him to break his masturbatory habit.

To throw light on cases in which love, that is, not an autistic motive but the erotic relation to another person, appears to be the cause of self-destruction, E. Eulenburg has examined the etiological factors operative in suicides committed by the pupils of the two upper classes of high-schools and found that in a not inconsiderable proportion of cases, precocious love-affairs had led to the catastrophe. The same as in suicides of adults, the erotic motive is most conspicuous in double-suicides. Here the youthful partner is usually of the male sex, while the older party is as a rule a married woman and usually the instigator. In suicides occurring during the period of puberty there is to be noted a characteristic difference in the numerical proportion of the sexes: The disturbances caused by the puberty itself are greater in girls than in boys, and furthermore, the emotional effects of sexual and erotic motives exercise a more intensive influence upon girls than boys. Thus the immediate motives, such as unrequited love, jealousy, "the results of an affair," etc., were recorded in 14,6 per cent. of youthful male suicides, and 40 per cent. of females. And while the total average of all suicides is in the proportion male: female = 3:1, the period of puberty shows on an average 43.75 per cent. of boys to 75 per cent. of girls.

Though homo-eroticism in suicides of school-children has so far not been demonstrable, it is to be taken into consideration that this motive is usually veiled; in future times it may probably be shown that it is of some significance in the suicides of juveniles.

As compared with the influence of puberty, to which some authors would like to ascribe the majority of love-suicides, the other ages of life play quite a subordinate rôle, whereby of course, the unreliability of all statistics must be borne in mind. Nevertheless, the following tabulation (G. v. Mayr), which we give for what it is worth, may not be without interest.

Unrequited love and jealousy (1896-1905).

Age	15-20	25-35	35-45	45-55	55-65	65-75	75 and over
Males	22,2	7,3	1,5	0,5	0,3	—	—
Females	28,1	12,8	1,2	—	—	0,5	—



The numerical preponderance of females (in the first two groups) is striking. For France the proportion is quite different and reveals a greater erotic emotionality on the side of the males. A comparison with other countries (England, Russia) shows the same difference in the gonochorism of suicide, and not only as regards the distribution of frequency and motives, but also as to the methods of suicide (Morselli). On the other hand, amongst the different nations, the proportion between female and male suicides is apparently more constant than the proportion between the population and the suicides in general. In Germany, suicide statistics seem to illustrate the more heroic love of the man as contrasted with the sentimental love of the woman. "The love of a strong man is deterred by no difficulty or danger when the acquisition of a beloved person is at stake . . . The love of weak persons is sentimental and may lead to suicide if unrequited, while under the same circumstances a strong character will commit a crime" (Krafft-Ebing). Owing to this relation between love-suicide and love-crime, "the former not frequently functions as a safety-valve for the general good and may be regarded as an indicator of our cultural level" (Freyer). Besides this, "it is astonishing to see how readily acute infatuation, not finding at once a way out, embraces suicide, and this is sometimes to be observed in quite banal persons."

The erotic motives are most patent in double-suicides which, though occasionally observed in the past, are in their present incidence a typical phenomenon. The older, purely physiological theory, according to which a high-strung sexual tension, not being relaxed, would lead to a catastrophe of both parties involved, has been found to be absolutely unavailable in the face of individual psychic actualities. It is characteristic for the majority of these cases that the idea of suicide occurs at first only to one partner, and is brought on later in the other by various suggestive influences, the more active party being almost regularly the woman, who on her side again pushes the at first reluctant man to suicide, which he executes as her tool. This explains why the frequently younger man, after the killing of his sweetheart and the removal of her suggestive influence, often relinquishes his primary intention of killing himself. But as a rule, the man kills the woman with her consent and then himself. Therefore these cases are suicides only in a psychological sense, while from the legal standpoint it is murder and suicide. In an especially abnormal psychic condition are rooted those cases of double-suicide in which "the true happiness of love and the ideal marriage are sought as a mystical consecration of the soul and union by



death" (Beier). There are also apparent double-suicides, in which the woman really commits suicide, while the man feigns his suicide, or where the woman is killed against her will and then the murderer commits suicide. Such cases are often brought to light during the post-mortem examination.

Also in individual cases, true suicides must be distinguished from apparent ones. "If a pregnant girl of good family shows a shot thru her heart and another shot directed toward the pelvic region, we have a clear case of suicide. The first shot, which was directed towards the abdomen, reveals distinctly the motive of her action. The conclusion that the unfortunate girl wanted to obliterate the evidence of her indiscretion, is quite patent (case of 1898). But if a pregnant woman dies from poison and this poison is found to be a recognized abortifacient, such as phosphorus, arsenic, sabina, or saffron, this is certainly not a case of suicide, but a case of attempted abortion with a fatal result. In such a case the woman had not the intention to kill herself as in the aforesaid case, she merely wanted to get rid of the result of her imprudence.. Hundreds of alleged suicides committed by women are in reality not suicides at all" (Kratter).

We do not want to enlarge on the subject of simulation and dissimulation of suicides in connection with sexual experiences, nor on the occasional derailment of the decision to commit suicide which was inspired by a sudden affect: "The psychopath, in a morbidly excited state because of his wife's infidelity or because his sweetheart repudiated him, decides to kill himself. By chance he meets the person who is the cause of his irritation : his wife, of her lover. Owing to this sudden exciting influence, the affect, perhaps kept back for a long time, breaks thru all inhibitions. The inner tension turns towards the other person, and instead of suicide, a murder will take place" (Birnbaum).

In police reports and official statistics, statements like "cause unknown," or "cause incurable disease," occupy a considerable space, mostly covering syphilis or homosexuality. Though we have no reliable statistics regarding syphilis as a motive of suicide, according to medical experience, it is quite considerable.

Here, two groups of suicides may be distinguished: 1. those in whom from a normal psychological standpoint the act is quite comprehensible, though prompted by a wrong and exaggerated idea regarding the dangerousness of the disease, and 2., those in which suicide is devoid of any rational foundation and only the expression of a morbid compulsory idea. The subject may be a syphilitic who refers the slightest accidental symptoms to his disease and lives in a constant fear of its eventual consequences,



till, in a paroxysm of depression, he commits suicide. There are also "Syphilophobiacs who, though never infected, arrive thru more or less phantastic constructions at the conclusion that they have acquired lues." (Löwenfeld.)

According to Hirschfeld's estimate, the incidence of suicides owing to homosexuality is about 3 per cent. of all urnings, and of the suicides directly due to homosexuality he distinguishes, besides those due to worry over their abnormality, three subdivisions, namely, (1) those committed during criminal proceedings against the respective homosexual individual; (2) those caused by blackmail; (3) those connected with a threatening scandal. Homosexuality may be the *indirect* cause of suicide where not the homosexual predisposition itself leads to the catastrophe, but where the homosexual inclinations have thrown the victim into situations with which he is unable to cope. In a considerable number of "shocking individual fatalities," the consciousness of the standards of society, and, finally, the suicide, follow one another in an uncannily monotonous sequence.

The true love-suicides represent a group of their own, and—owing to constitutional as well as external causes—are more frequent amongst homosexual than amongst normal individuals. These suicides are not at all astonishing if we take into consideration that "the affection of an urning for the object of his love, especially in the negative direction of his desire and jealousy, may be of an enormous violence," (Hirschfeld). Of great significance are the double-suicides of homosexuals: out of 100 suicides, 12 men and 8 girls, that is to say, 10 couples, died together.

That menstruation, the generative phases, and the age of involution are liable to create favorable conditions for the rise of suicidal impulses, must appear quite comprehensible, if we take into consideration how even in normal individuals these processes influence woman's psyche in the sense of hypochondriacal and melancholic depression. Thus amongst juvenile female suicides, menstruating girls are in the majority. The majority of menstrual, generative and climacteric suicides may be only the expression of a corresponding psychosis, which however, does not preclude an individualizing evaluation: amongst 124 persons brought from 1904-6 to the psychiatric clinic of Munich for attempted suicide, only one individual was found mentally sound—a 21 year old servant girl, in the eighth month of pregnancy. Besides the sexual-psychically and sexual-pathopsychically determined cases, the socially determined cases amongst the suicides of pregnant women are of considerable significance (*unmarried gravaidae*). In suicides committed during the climacterium, the idea of "being



now an old person," of "being at the end of the rope," of "having played out as a woman," plays an important rôle. As a matter of fact, during her whole life, a woman—consciously or unconsciously—is always under the influence of the dread of old age.

Of further specifically feminine love- and sex-motives underlying suicide, the following may be mentioned: Women who have been insulted or deceived by their lovers or husbands not infrequently commit suicide prompted by the hope that the survivor would bewail her death, miss her, and love her now more than he did during her life-time. Here the same infantile "spite-mechanism" is operative as in those cases in which a girl marries an unloved man with the sole view of causing grief and life-long mortification to her true lover. A noticeable motive for suicide committed by females is the fear of the discovery of their defloration. The self-destruction of brides immediately before the marriage ceremony is not infrequently prompted by this motive. On the other hand, in psychopathic or otherwise abnormal girls just the reverse may be the case, that is to say, the fear of being deflowered, or the aversion against sexual union, may lead to suicide. In this connection may be mentioned the suicides (or attempts at suicide) of women on the morning following the bridal night. Here the motives are usually enveloped in obscurity, though we know that they are almost always of a sexual character. To a rather unusual group belong those cases in which girls or women who had become the victims of rape, kill themselves from shame and desperation. According to the testimony of history, quite a few women committed suicide in order to escape from an attack against their chastity, or to revenge themselves: Lucretia, Hippia, Saphronia.

Amongst the specific causes prompting men to commit suicide, impotence seems to be of primary importance. The deficiency of the sexual power may lead to such a depression that life appears unbearable. Such desperate acts are occasionally committed by young married men who in the bridal night found themselves wanting, but also in other cases sexual insufficiency may produce such a feeling of inferiority that death appears to be preferable to life.

As to the family status of suicides, it has been noted that the proportion of married men is greater than that of bachelors. Regarding women, the reverse obtains. Suicides are especially frequent amongst widowed and divorced men and women. The highest percentage of female suicides is furnished by those women who for one reason or other are without the protection afforded by marriage, that is to say, spinsters, widows, divorced and



deserted women. The latter three groups show a greater propensity to suicide than spinsters: the loss of the married life predisposes more to suicide than complete celibacy. Of course, there are also other sexual factors involved. The significance of children as a prophylaxis against suicide appears in a particular light if we see that during married life three times more childless women commit suicide than mothers, and that after the dissolution of the marriage tie the number of female suicides with children is fifty per cent. less than that of childless women.

In a discussion of suicide and its sexological relations, two significant facts should not be overlooked. "The incidence of suicide runs parallel with that of sexual crimes" (Aschaffenburg). It is unworthy that in winter, that is, during a season in which economic misery brings many to the brink of despondency, comparatively few persons die by their own hand. This regularity—rapid rise in spring and an equally rapid decrease during summer—holds true not only for Germany but also the other European countries. Of all explanations advanced for finding the cause of this phenomenon, the most tenable is that sexual crimes and the majority of suicides are both manifestations of a "sex periodicity." This becomes clear by the demonstrable parallelism between the maximum of female suicides during May, and the maximum of illegitimate births in February. Further light is shed on the relation between suicide and sex by a survey of the methods employed in suicide: Women generally resort to hanging, drowning and poisoning. Also men have a predilection for the rope, while drowning and poisoning are more preferred by women. The precipitation from a high place and the inhalation of gas might almost be called specifically feminine methods of suicide. In contrast to these feminine methods, men appear to prefer death by shooting and certain other "bloody" procedures, such as stabbing, the cutting of the throat, the opening of an artery, etc. These differences in the methods of suicide correspond to general psychic sex differentiations, and in this connection it should be noted that the proportions of these different methods do not remain constant. Thus, between the years 1913-1919, in Prussia, the following deviations were recorded: in 1913 about 51 per cent. of all male suicides made use of the rope, while in 1919 only 46.5 hanged themselves; male suicides by drowning receded by one-third; but in 1919, 26,3 per cent. of males shot themselves, as against 23 per cent. in 1913, while death by gas rose from 2,1 per cent. to 7,1 per cent. The proportion of gas suicides on the part of women has increased considerably, while the percentage of female suicides by hanging fell down from 33,6 to 26,7, and by drowning from 30,8 to 25,3 per cent.



(Translated for The Journal of Sexology and Psychanalysis)  
ANTIVENEREAL PROPHYLAXIS IN MOROCCO

By DR. CARLE, Lyons, France

When I recently, in Gaucher's Annals (Ann. d. Mal. Vén.), expanded my program on combatting of venereal diseases, I was not aware that it had been already adopted and was being carried out in the new French protectorate of Morocco. A pleasure trip to this country afforded me the opportunity to observe the beneficial effects resulting from the introduction of the prophylactic measures always advocated by me. A description of how the prophylactic treatment was adapted to the Islamitic customs will be of interest.

The principles regarding this problem may be summed up as follows: Avoidance of the extremes of a sentimental abolitionism, which, under the pretext of individual liberty, would not attempt to prevent the prostitute from being at large and spreading her disease; on the other hand, repression by the police and neglect of medical treatment. Considering that these women ply an insalubrious trade which cannot be suppressed, we should place at their disposition all the facilities of hygiene, prophylaxis and treatment, under the sole condition that they make use of them under the direction of the physician, and that those who are unreasonable or disobedient should know that the medical organization is backed by the strong hand of the police agent.

The basic idea of the Moroccan system finds expression in the institution of "benevolent regulations," extended to the very large class of prostitutes who voluntarily submit to examination and treatment. The one as well as the other may be carried out either in the dispensary or by a physician whom the woman may select. The latter, by virtue of his membership in the professional association, is endowed with official powers to keep the patient under observation, and to avail himself of the central service, in case she should disappear.

These women are dealt with just as other persons affected with contagious diseases, and everyone knows the obligations, disagreeable as they may be, imposed by the State on those suspected of epidemic diseases.

In short, the sanitary service is no longer the antechamber of a hospital which resembles more or less a prison, but a true medical service, provided with a laboratory, where examinations are made and preventive treatment is given.

On several occasions I have pointed out how, owing to this security given to the women, the attendance at our clinic in Lyons

*Progres Médical.*



has increased. I have had the pleasure to control, on a very much larger field, the same happy results in Morocco. To cite a few examples: In the year 1921, in Fez, the number of consultations rose to 24,814, and the laboratory examinations to 4847; in 1920, in Tangier, there were 11,838 consultations; 9981 in Cacablanca; 24,121 in Marrakech; and intravenous injections are given every day.

It is remarkable how in their simplemindedness the natives understood at once the benefits accruing from these medications. These women saw how in a few days the worst eruptions, the most painful patches, and the most disgusting facial ulcerations were healed. Logically they concluded that it was to their own interest to submit to this treatment. Being ignorant of the prejudice attaching to the "shameful disease," being free of the traditional fear of the police, they came to the dispensary as to a place where a hospitable welcome was awaiting them. And the same might be the case in France were it not for the purity howlers and their political missions who in the name of morality and society brand with the stigma of infamy those who have caught the disease.

In Morocco, the "medical conception of social hygiene" has produced an appropriate organization. In all the larger cities I found laboratories, serologic examinations, well-lighted examination rooms, opportunities for individual examinations and prophylactic instruction for every newcomer. The waiting rooms are clean and not like lock-ups. I saw many men in plain clothes and very few policemen in uniform. One had the happy idea to install the medical service in any building available, often in old Moorish palaces, instead of in modern structures which might have been satisfactory to the latest fancies of the hygienist, but the erection of which would have eaten up all the money on hand. Being what they are, I would gladly recommend them as models to our large provincial towns where the physicians are obliged to utilize an obscure room in a corner of the commissariate, where the "delinquents," without a subsequent observation, are hurriedly examined on an antedeluvian unwashable table, only assisted by an old retired policeman or an old converted madame.

Besides the absence of traditional prejudices and the marvelous results obtained by this treatment, there are other local factors which explain the success of this medical organization in Morocco. First of all, the fact that prostitution is and always has been considered a punishable offense before the Moslem law. In the case of an old offender with a contagious disease



who flees, our physicians need the help of the Pasha's police; on account of those old habits it is not necessary to set in motion the whole administrative machinery. We evidently are far from this conception, however disputable it may be from the moral point of view, in our own country, where in twenty years our legislators have not yet been able to lay before the chamber a bill which would make street-walking a punishable offense.

Now, as to the segregated district. At the risk of being considered oldfashioned or a monster by some adepts who are exasperated in regard to the question of individual liberty, I can't help expressing my approval of this legalized form of prostitution. As a physician as well as a hygienist and even as a man, I am unable to understand the ignominy attaching to the licensed house. However, it has disappeared spontaneously. But as regards the segregated district, things are quite different. An immense district such as that of Moulay-Abdallah, in Fez, has evidently too many crumbling walls, alleys and dirty old courtyards. If I were administrator, I would tear down some of these dilapidated houses, to make room for broad thoroughfares, gardens, fountains, vast verdant squares with towering sun-bathed terraces. I do believe that the districts reserved for the *hetairae* in ancient Greece were laid out in such a way. And at the threshold of the doors with raised hangings, the Moslems of Moulay-Abdallah reiterate the simple attitudes of their remote ancestors, which we see engraved on the pedestals of Assyrian columns and the bulging bellies of Etruscan vases.

During a visit in the company of the chief-physician one has opportunity to study the differences of mentality, easily explainable by the difference in the treatment. The arrival of a physician in a French brothel is the signal for the ringing of bells from the cellar to the garret; one hears the alarmed rustling of petticoats the wearers of which seek refuge in the most recondite corners. The physician is the enemy, and the attendants of the house get busy to hide minors, infected women and those suspected of having the disease.

At Moulay-Abdallah, the physician is a friend. On his arrival, he is at once surrounded by a bevy of little Arab girls, each one of them eager to be the first to kiss his hand. This may not be hygienic, but there is a heart in it. The conversation is amiable, and so is the examination. One gives a calling down to the Sudanese woman for having her bottle of permanganate of potassium empty; one makes an appointment with the little Berber girl for her next injection, and then one drinks three cups of mint tea in accordance with the code of Moslem politeness.



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

Prostitution thus regarded, as I have pointed out elsewhere, is a manifestation of the social spirit as it prevailed amongst the ancient Greeks and is still found in the smaller towns of Spain and Italy. I would like to make some comparisons with the same districts of our seaports, but I prefer not to do so, because the comparison would not be favorable to the latter; nor as regards decency, for the Moslem women are differently dressed and more reserved; nor from an esthetic standpoint, for the variety of races offers to the disinterested observer a vast material for the most interesting ethnological studies.

On leaving the house we are again reminded of modern hygiene in the form of a prophylactic hut provided with protargol and calomel ointment. A corpulent guard invites those that leave to help themselves. I am astonished at the rapidity with which the young soldiers go thru this procedure: These, explains the kind guard, have assured me that they have not "indulged." For all that the chief physician advises the guard to exercise a little more skepticism and rigor.

It is a singular medley one sees filing before one's eyes; the faience palaces and modern houses, burnusses and horizon blue uniforms, Moslem women with deep eyes and calomel ointment—a continuous antithesis which endows Morocco with an atmosphere of its own: everywhere the thirteenth Arab century rubbing elbows with the twentieth, almost without any transitional stages. This fusion is going on without any violent clashes, thanks to the wise gallantry of our soldiers, but—not to forget—our physicians, who, as declared in the official proclamation issued by Marshal Liautey, have been the principal factors in bringing about penetration, assimilation and pacification.

---



# Criticism and Comment

## WHY SILENCE IS GOLDEN

One day one of Dr. Ferenczi's patients was unusually talkative, so that both he and the patient noticed it. Thereupon, Dr. F. took occasion to inform the patient of the psycho-analytic identification of gold with fæces and to point out to him that he was stingy with both, but that on this particular day he was extravagant. Then Dr. F. went on to inform his patient that this identification between gold and fæces explains the significance of the aphorism that "silence is golden." Silence, he said, is golden only because refraining from speaking means a saving (of effort).

Another one of Dr. F.'s patients suffered from spasms of the vocal cords and spasm of the sphincter ani, both symptoms occurring simultaneously and in the same (?) degree. When he is exhilarated his speech is loud and fluent and his stool copious and "satisfactory"; but when he is depressed and in the presence of his superiors, he becomes speechless and at the same time gets rectal tenesmus. Dr. F. tells us that this patient was one of those who retain their fæces because they expect to be "strengthened" (physically and psychically) by so doing and who fear to be "weakened" by an evacuation. He is convinced that this goes back to accidents in infancy in which the patients were "too weak" to hold back their stool. The tendency to hold back which is thus engendered extends to other psychic spheres and causes the patient to hold back all their emotions, all "outpourings of emotions;" an emotional outbreak that could not be restrained may cause as much unhappiness as the infantile anal in continence did.

Professor Freud had previously called Dr. F.'s attention to the connection between speech and anal eroticism and had referred to a stutterer whose speech disturbance he linked up with anal-erotic fantasies. Dr. Jones, too, had spoken of a displacement of the libido from the anal upon the phonetic. Dr. F., too, had traced a connection between musical utterance and anal-eroticism.

From the above considerations Dr. F. thought himself justified in concluding that speech and anal-eroticism are always associated with each other. That folk-psychology recognized this fact is proved, he thinks, by the adage: "Silence is golden." (*Internat-Zeitsch. f. aertzliche Psychoanalyse*, 1917, pp. 155-156.)

To us it has always seemed that the above adage had its foundation in the universal experience of mankind that it often regretted having said something that it subsequently wished had remained unspoken. Though the ability to speak and communicate with our



fellows is precious, to be able to maintain silence is often much more precious. To express this idea mankind has compared speech and silence to silver and gold, respectively.

The virtues of silence have been recognized and lauded by some of the greatest thinkers. Bonnard said: "Silence is the genius of fools and one of the virtues of the wise." That silence often "is more eloquent than words," we all know. Carlyle was content with saying that though "speech is great, silence is greater," thus showing no inner compulsion for an anal-erotic evacuation. On another occasion he said that whereas "speech is shallow as Time, silence is deep as Eternity," thus again showing the absence of any unconscious compulsion to an anal-erotic utterance. Menander knew that "nothing is more useful than silence." John Boyle O'Reilly expressed a maxim of universal validity when he said, "Be silent and safe,—silence never betrays you." In the four words of the last sentence are contained the explanation for the adage engaging our attention. Plutarch knew this when he wrote that Simonides "never repented that he had held his tongue, but often that he had spoken."

The value of silence has never been more beautifully implied than in Omar's quatrain:

The Moving Finger writes; and, having writ,  
Moves on: nor all your Piety nor Wit  
Shall lure it back to cancel half a Line,  
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.

—S. A. T.

---

### BEAUDELAIRE'S "INCEST-COMPLEX"

In 1910, Dr. Stekel called attention to the following interesting passage in one of Beaudelaire's letters in which the sensual aspect of a child's love for its mother is emphasized:

"What is it that the child loves so in its mother, its nurse, its favorite sister? Is it no more than the agent who feeds it, combs it, washes it, rocks it? It is also affection and sensual pleasure. To the child, this affection is evident without the woman's knowledge, from her whole feminine charm. And so the child loves its mother, sister or nurse, because her silken garment or her fur scarf tickles it; it loves the scent of her neck and her hair, the tinkle of her jewels, the play of her garters, etc. . . . the whole mundus muliebris which begins with the shirt and expresses itself even in the furniture to which the woman imparts the spirit of her being."



## CRITICISM AND COMMENT

Dr. Rank, a year later, supplemented the above with a quotation from a letter Beaudelaire had written from the insane asylum, in which he was confined, to Mme. Meurice: "Shall I tell you how much I love you? . . . I have been considered here as an agent of the police (fine! isn't it?); they believe me to be a disciple of boy-love (I spread this rumor and they believed it): and then they regarded me as a censor of obscene literature who had been sent to Brussels on this account. In despair that they believe everything I say, *I spread the rumor that I had killed my father and eaten him* and that I had been permitted to escape from France only because I had rendered the police such good service. And they believed that! I swim in disgrace as a fish does in water."

Dr. Rank's comment on the above is worth quoting. He says (*Zentralblatt f. Psychoanalyse*, 1911, p. 275): "That this apparently whimsical self-accusation of patricide was not chosen arbitrarily but emanates from a paranoiac projection of a desire deeply rooted in the Unconscious, is confirmed by the above unconcealed complementary love-passion for his mother."

Oddly enough, it seems to have escaped the Doctor's attention that the above quotations "prove" Beaudelaire also to have had a deep-rooted cannibalistic complex (he spoke of eating his dead father), to have been cutaneously erotic (because, he says, children are tickled by silk garments worn by the mother), also fetichistic as to fur and hair and jewelry, also to have been afflicted with auditory eroticism (the sound of jewelry, he says, delights children. Had Beaudelaire been a musician his talent would unquestionably have been "explained" by this fact), as well as with olfactory eroticism (children are pleased with the odor of the mother's neck). And of course, he was anal-erotic, otherwise he would not have thought of mentioning the fact about the odor of the neck and hair. And, of course, too, he was sadistic, or it would not have occurred to him to speak of killing his father; and, by the law of bipolarity, he was necessarily also masochistic.

S. A. T.

---

## THE SYMBOLISM OF RIGHT AND LEFT.

From time immemorial the left side has been a symbol for something inauspicious or unfavorable. The reason for this is probably to be found in the fact that the left hand, and perhaps the left foot, too, is clumsier, more awkward and less skilful than the right. By extension, the left has thus become the symbol also for what is silly, foolish, stupid, insincere, and even malicious.



And, unquestionably, the left is often—by a cheap pun—employed as a symbol for what is morally wrong, i. e., the opposite of right. That the left should be used as a symbol for what is feminine is now easily comprehensible; the right, in that case, being a symbol for what is masculine, strong, efficient, adequate. Since the suggestions of psycho-analysts, the left is often employed as a symbol for homosexuality and the right (morally) for heterosexuality. In a very interesting pamphlet on “foot and shoe symbolism and erotism” by Dr. Aigremont, published in German in 1909, we find the following interesting comments on right and left:

“Even in early times the right and the left side, the right and the left foot, were invested with a symbolic significance. The preference for the right half of the body (hand, foot) is ancient, probably because of the many centuries during which the left half of the brain cortex has been functioning. The two sexes were compared to the two sides; in the right side they saw the active, acquiring, masculine principle, in the left the passive, retentive, feminine principle; the right is the procreative side, the left the receptive side. We have abundant and adequate evidence to show that antiquity assigned femininity to the left side. Plutarch quotes the very common opinion that boys emanate from the right testicle and girls from the left. This differentiation is especially marked in the case of the foot: the right foot is regarded as masculine, the left as feminine. The left is dedicated to the maternal earth goddess, the telluric femininity. The shod Jason wears a sandal on the right foot and loses the left sandal in the mud, i. e., the earth-fructifying demon strides over the conceiving earth-fruitfulness, her cteis, which the demon impregnates. In connection with Jason’s naked left foot the scholiast to Pyth.:133 remarks that the Aetolians went into battle with the left foot naked, and Macrobius reports that (an Italian tribe) borrowed the custom from the Aetolians. Bachofen explains that this partial nakedness was not due to any practical advantage from the point of view of military equipment; but that the uncovering of the left foot represented an offering of the left shoe to the divine mother. It is therefore a remnant of ancient matriarchy; these tribes thus proved themselves scions and worshippers of the great feminine principle in nature. As such an Aetolian Meleager, as Euripides tells us expressly in his tragedy of *Meleager*, goes into battle with the boars with his left foot naked. But even today the left foot is looked upon as feminine, exactly as in children’s games the right index finger is regarded as the husband of the left (feminine) index finger. Because of its feminine symbolism, the gypsy women of Southern Hungary mix a few drops of blood



## CRITICISM AND COMMENTS

from the left foot with some hair from their boys' heads, cook the mixture with quince-seeds till it makes a gruel, and then chew on it.

"In general the right foot was regarded as the strong (masculine) one by the Greeks and the Romans, and modernized civilized peoples regard it as the lucky one. One should begin one's journey, walk, march, etc., with the right foot. The Germans, for example, believe that when one wants to have luck in an important undertaking, one should cross the threshold with the right foot first. Among the Turks, a bride enters the house of her groom with the right foot, thus ensuring a happy marriage. If, in spite of all this, we find that in antiquity the left side (e. g., the left foot) was considered the good one, the lucky one, the fact is to be explained by the idea of feminine tellurism, of fruitful and therefore blessed womanhood, to whom the left side was consecrated. The preference in religion, as well as in the family, is awarded to the left, the feminine, the "good" side. In the thoughts of modern peoples this obscure background has disappeared; and the clumsy left side, especially the left foot, brings little luck. So we say that one who makes a mis-step with the left foot must be prepared for disappointment; that one who is in ill-humor stands on his left foot; that one who gets out of bed with his left foot first will have hard luck that day. And yet we also say (perhaps as an echo of the above ancient notions) that one who crosses the threshold with the left foot first will have luck (Czecho-Slovak); one who stumbles with the left foot will experience joy (German)."

It is certainly curious and worthy of note that the English word "left" etymologically means "weak, worthless." Whether this is true of other languages I do not know.

Other interesting uses of the word "left" are given in the New English Dictionary, e. g., to see with the left eye, to work with the left hand (implying inefficiency in performance); to take a thing by the left ear; to go over the left shoulder (to be squandered); over the left (a slang phrase implying that the words to which it is appended express the reverse of what is really meant), etc. In continental legislatures, the left wing is the section of the members who occupy seats on the left side of the chamber (as viewed from the president's chair), a situation which is by custom assigned to those holding relatively liberal or democratic opinions. Hence, the term is applied to the more advanced or innovating section of a philosophical school, a religious sect, or the like.

S. A. T.



## HOW DREAMS ARE PSYCHO-ANALYSED

To prove the occurrence of symbols in dreams and in the Unconscious, Freud cites (*Zentralblatt f. Psychoanalyse*, 1911, pp. 187-188) his analyses of a few dreams whose interpretation thru his knowledge of symbolism was peculiarly illuminating. When these dreams are thus interpreted, says he, "they acquire a meaning (which they would otherwise not have), find their place in the dreamers' thought processes and are accepted by the subjects as interpretations." In connection with this he maintains that in dream analysis the subject's free association cease when he comes to a dream-symbol, and that this stoppage in the associations leads the analyst to suggest a symbolic interpretation. We quote one of these analyses *in toto*:

*"The hat as a symbol of the male (the male genital). A fragment from the dream of a young woman suffering from agoraphobia (a fear of going in public places) consequent upon a fear of being tempted. 'It's a summer day and I am taking a walk in the street; I am wearing a straw hat of a peculiar shape, the central portion being bent upward and the sides hanging down (the description is given hesitatingly) in such a manner that one of these is lower than the other. I am cheerful and am self-assured, and as I pass a group of young military officers I think to myself: None of you can do me any harm.'*

"Inasmuch as she was unable to produce any associations to the hat in the dream, I say to her: The hat is in all likelihood a male genital with an upward-directed central portion and two dependant lateral portions. It may perhaps strike you as queer that I speak of the hat as a man, but we have the idiom: 'to come under the hood' for 'to get married.' I purposely kept back the interpretation of the detail that one part hung lower than the other, although the determination of just such details must point the way to the interpretation. I continue: If she has a husband with such a magnificent genital organ, she has nothing to fear from the officers, *i. e.*, she has nothing to wish for from them, inasmuch as otherwise she is virtually deterred by her temptation fantasies from going about without the protection of an escort. On the basis of other material I had on numerous occasions already given her this latter explanatin of the meaning of her fear.

"The patient's behavior after this interpretation is extremely noteworthy. She retracts the description of the hat and denies having said that the lateral portions hung down. But I am too sure of what I had heard to permit myself to be taken in and insist on my point. For a while she is silent and then she finds



## CRITICISM AND COMMENTS

the courage to ask what it means that one of her husband's testicles hangs lower than the other and if that is so in all men. And thus this peculiar detail concerning the hat was explained and she accepted the whole interpretation.

"I had known the hat-symbol long before I had heard the above dream."

That the above analysis really proves nothing is obvious. There is nothing to show that the woman would ever have associated "penis" to "hat." She did not know and had never heard that a hat could be a penis-symbol; hence she could not have used the hat as such a symbol in her dreams. There is absolutely no reason why a hat should be such a symbol, in any case.

The statement is constantly made by psycho-analysts that they do not interpret the patient's dreams, but let the patient do so for himself. The above analysis disproves their assertion.

That a woman should have no associations to a hat is an impossibility. Careful questioning would have brought out associations to the hat and to all its peculiarities.

The analysis is utterly worthless also because we have absolutely no data about the walk which is reproduced in the dream, the group of soldiers that the woman passed, and the thought she had when she passed them. Where did all this material come from? What is its history?

The reader must also notice that Freud smuggled into the interpretation something for which the dream gives not the slightest hint: that her husband had a "magnificent genital,"—the woman had spoken only of a hat "of a peculiar shape." As a matter of fact, if the hat were a penis-symbol, the dream might mean a disparagement of her husband's genitals which were "peculiar," the middle part (the penis) being "bent" instead of straight. And, furthermore, if his phallus is inadequate, there is good reason why she should have sexual ideas when she passes a group of military officers (a very common symbol for virility and sexual license).

That such analyses as the above are really worthless in the treatment of the neuroses is shown by the fact that the woman was still uncured though Freud had on numerous occasions told her that her agoraphobia was due to a fear of being tempted in the street. The constant repetition of such an interpretation is nothing more than a variety of suggestion. And if so, "psycho-analysis" has no right to call itself a science.

Finally it must be pointed out that Freud's interpretation of the above dream is strikingly pointless, meaningless, and inept. That the woman "accepted" the interpretation, or seemed to do so, is wholly irrelevant and insignificant.

S. A. T.



# Abstracts and Translations

## SEXUALITY AND PSYCHIC LOVE

Ludwig Schmülling ("Die Neue Generation," June, 1922) is astonished at the hazy ideas held by professional men as well as laymen on "love between the sexes." In general, the latter is conceived as a "combination" of sexuality and psychic love. Regarding the character of this "combination," the views are widely divergent.

Philosophers and scientists, especially medical men, define psychic love as elevated sexuality, as ennobled sexual love, advancing the theory of "sexual love" being humanized by spiritual components. Some poets and psychologists would draw a line between sexuality and psychic love, regarding each as an independent entity, without, however, expressing any clear idea as to the individual character of each. In common speech and scientific terminology, both conceptions are continually confused.

In analyzing "human love," medical men, like Forel, Bloch, Kemnitz, Moll, Krafft-Ebing proceed from man's phylogenetic development, applying the evolutionary idea to the development of erotic feelings. They agree in the deduction: Man is a highly developed cerebral animal, belonging to the large simian family; through differentiated psychic feelings, the primitive sex instinct became gradually enriched to finally represent an intricate conglomeration of primitive impulses and social feelings, which we call love.

Schmülling says these antiquated theories do not indicate a way for the solution of the extraordinarily difficult problems of love. An explanation has been attempted by our greatest psychological poets and thinkers, as Goethe, Dostoyevsky, Strindberg, Wedekind, Tolstoy, Jäger, Ibsen and others.

The depths of the human soul into which those psychological anatomists enabled us to look, are so appalling that we shudder, and grasp for a support.

All those phenomena designated as bondage of love, as "love-hatred," as erotomania; all those terrible conflicts between sexual and psychic love raging in the inner life of the same individual, cannot be explained by the theories which so far have been advanced.

Moreover, all the practical questions regarding sex reform, polygamy, prostitution, marital irregularities, divorce, regeneration of love, etc., must remain unsolved before the natural history of



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

the sexual apparatus and the human heart have been explored.

"Feelings should be studied by the same methods as are employed in the study of organisms. The anatomy of the human heart has not yet been written." (Flaubert.)

Science has always been guilty of two mistakes: first, it laid too much stress on the study of the natural history of the sexual impulses and sexual organs of our animal ancestors, thereby neglecting the study of the psychic sympathetic feelings of the highly organized animals; and, second, Science ignored that dark unexplored region lying behind consciousness, the borderland of the Soul, out of which rise all those unconscious affective feelings, before which our understanding shrinks back in awe as from an uncanny illusion.

Science never succeeded in expressing the concept "soul" by a clear formula; in spite of the most scholarly psychological researches, an elementary "Science of the Soul" has never been produced. In short, in exploring the sensory complex "love," Science proceeds like the ancient geographers, who while searching for the sources of the Nile, at the same time bungled with the simplest physical principles.

In his Essay, "Wechselwirkung zwischen Sexualität und Seelenliebe," Schmülling tried to demonstrate, from a phylogenetic and psychological point of view, the fundamentally different character of sexual and psychic love, thereby reaching the conclusion that psychic love is essentially different from sexuality, that it springs from a different source and belongs in a class *sui generis*.

Both currents of feeling may be equally intense, they may intermingle, thus doubling their energies, but, on the other hand, they may manifest themselves in different forms, be diametrically opposed, take a different course. In short, the author espouses a consistent dualism between sexuality and psychic love, believing that from his standpoint he is able to explain all those disharmonies, perversities, and love-hatred ("Liebeshass"), etc., which have aroused a general demand for a regeneration of love and sex reform.

Today we are fed on Sex-lore ad nauseam, but remain unenlightened regarding the phenomena of psychic love.

It is woman's tragic fate of having her love-life directed by men, whose erotic feelings are more physical and brutal than woman's, the latter centering her love in a purely psychic sphere.

It is just the psychogenetic consideration of love-life which is bound to lead to inferences quite opposite to those in vogue.

Already in the higher developed animal we can distinguish be-



tween the periodic sex urge and the continuous complex of purely psychic sympathies. For instance, the psychic comradeship of apes in captivity, of dogs, cats, birds, is so intense that the death of one excites the deepest grief in the other. Just as in man, this psychic affection may be of either a neutral or of a sexual character.

The author is an adherent of Schleich's view, who believes in the ubiquity of the soul in each cell of the organism. In the form of a definite energy, the soul radiates from each cell, each ganglion, each nerve, fibre, hormone, and, according to the sexes, these energies are charged either positively or negatively.

The sex differences between man and woman do not spring merely from the primary and secondary sex characteristics, but from a fundamental sexual difference between each cell and pore. In a normal man, each emanation, each phosphorescence of the brain, each discharge of energy, is specifically masculine; in the normal woman, feminine.

The erotic feelings of a purely psychic character are likewise sexually polarized, because the energies represent either positive or negative currents. If, for instance, a woman is cold towards a man as a sexual being, but possessed of the most intense feelings for the same man as the bearer of a marked masculine character and mind (as, e. g., Charlotte von Stein for young Goethe), we are confronted by a psychic affection, which, though not sexual, is sexually determined. This psychic love, which must not be confounded with Platonic love, is not neutral, but springs from psychic sex characteristics.

To make himself more clear, the author adduces Chopin's love for George Sand, Grillparzer's for Kati Frölich, Michelangelo's for Vittoria Colonna, Delacroix's for Madame Remuyat, and points out that all these relations were of a passionately erotic, though asexual, character. Their highstrung souls were blended in expressive contact, and lips vibrating with voluptuous desire met in ecstatic love. But the sexual organs were in abeyance, congenial energies emanating only from the complex of psychic sympathies.

This explains the romantic love felt for noble damozels, which inspired the troubadours to go in search of duels and adventures, to please their high-bred ladies, while, at the same time, they ravished peasant girls and dairy-maids.

This may sound barbarous to sensitive ears, but to understand man's soul we must courageously face these eccentricities of nature.

Similar specters lurk in the most recondite recesses of woman's



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

soul. Behold that refined, hyper-esthetic lady, eagerly engaged in conversation with a distinguished, intellectual man, and at the same time feeling strange sexual longings for a brutal prize-fighter or a coarse chauffeur.

Here are at work invisible energies, waves of emotions passing from one individual to another, till finally they merge.

Here we are standing before the unexplored labyrinth whose intricate paths lead to telepathy, clairvoyance and hypnotism, to the hidden springs of love and sexuality—to a region lying beyond our ken.

---

### MORBID DESIRE TO CLIP GOLDEN LOCKS

Dr. Petersen, of Duesseldorf, (Münch. Med. Wochenschrift, April 7, 1922), reports the case of an unmarried man, bookkeeper, aged 30, who was apprehended in the act of cutting off the blond tresses of a young girl.

He came from a psychopathic family: two of his mother's sisters were for more than twenty years confined in insane asylums; one uncle on his mother's side is an idiot from infancy, another an alcoholic. Of ten children borne by his mother, 5 died of eclampsia in early infancy; one is an imbecile; four are suffering from eye diseases (lamellar cataract, nystagmus).

Repeated examinations of the defendant revealed a cardiac neurosis (tachycardia, usually up to 120 beats), and a slight nystagmus; mentally he appeared somewhat dull. Ten years ago, he fell on his head and broke one arm, which healed so badly that he was brought to the hospital and had to undergo an operation, which was followed, for several months, by great irritability, insomnia, tremor and pronounced tachycardia.

He was in the war for four years, taking part in 27 battles, without being wounded.

Regarding his perversion, he made the following statement: During his eighth year of life, he was regularly sent on errands to an inn, where he often saw how a blond girl of his own age was being combed. This always aroused his sexual feelings and caused him to have erections. During the years of puberty, the sight of blondes excited him to such a degree that he always masturbated, which he never did without that external stimulation. This desire for the hair of girls gradually increased, so that for several days he would be unbalanced, physically and mentally, after he had seen a blonde; insomnia, irritability, anxiety, headache, cardiac troubles, interfered with his work, and led to altercations



with his employer, who otherwise was quite satisfied with him. Regularly after masturbation he regained his equipoise. He never indulged in sexual intercourse, on account of religious reasons, as he declared. He controlled his perverse impulse so that he never appropriated the hair of girls, but was satisfied to pick up hair-ribbons, lost by blondes. The ribbons he would caress and hold under his nose, whereby he became sexually excited.

Thus things went on for years, nobody having the slightest idea of his perversion and his inner struggles—till one Saturday, in the spring of 1920. After drinking half a bottle of wine in a restaurant, he went out in the street where he saw a blond girl. Of a sudden, the desire for the possession of the golden locks took such a hold of him that—impulsively, almost unconsciously—with a pair of pocket scissors, he cut off about four inches of the girl's braid.

He was caught in the very act.

Neither at the police-station nor during the examinations and trials before the jury, and later at the Court of Appeals, was he able to explain his act. He was not intoxicated, though the alcohol may have had a benumbing effect. He stated, again and again, that the desire for the possession of the blond locks had of a sudden taken such a hold of him that he committed the act as if under a compulsion, and that he felt that he could not do otherwise.

The jury condemned him to one year's imprisonment, because "the cutting off of tresses was a malicious attack with a dangerous instrument, and such a disfigurement was bound to cause a painful sensation in the injured person."

The Court of Appeals was not convinced of this "painful sensation," but under the assumption that the defendant was guilty of the infliction of bodily harm with a dangerous instrument, and in consideration of his mental inferiority, he was condemned to pay a fine.

In commenting on this case, the writer points to the defendant's hereditary taint as the basis of his perversion. Also the events of his life, the accident, his participation in many battles, had certainly affected his nervous system and weakened his power of resistance. Of further significance is his statement of the first stirring of his sexual impulse and its gradual development. Of interest is also the description how he was taken unawares on seeing the blond hair, his impulse being so powerful that undoubtedly in the moment when he committed the act, his consciousness must have been clouded and his power of will obliterated.

Such a condition is comparable to a transitory psychic disturbance in which all the inhibitions are thrown overboard and the



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

instinct with all its natural violence breaks through all barriers.

The present instance does not give a direct answer to the question whether the perverse impulse of the fetichist is acquired or hereditary, though the occurrence of an orgasm in a boy eight years old would hardly plead in favor of hereditary.

A year and a half after the commission of the act, and about one year after the trial, the writer subjected the chap to occasional hypnotic treatment and noted that he had become entirely free of his morbid desire, which now appeared to him as something strange, weird and incomprehensible.

The writer believes that the young man would have hardly been able to overcome his perversion if it had been hereditary.

When three months later he declared his intention to get married, the writer did not hesitate for a moment to give his consent, inasmuch as for more than a year he had not yielded to masturbation. In this instance the writer regarded matrimony as a sure protection against a recurrence.

Coitus is now performed to full mutual satisfaction, and the young man feels happy and contented since regular sexual intercourse has made him a normal human being.

---

## THE SEXUAL INSTINCT

C. Mcfie Campbell, M. D. (Jl. Abnormal and Social Psychology. vol. XVI, 1921-1922).

The writer points to the great importance of the sexual instinct in both normal and abnormal psychology. In the normal child the sexual instinct seems at an early age to color the activities and the interests; at puberty it causes turmoil; at adolescence it adds glamor and intensity to the world; thruout the prime of life it influences conscious motives and unconscious driving forces. In the neurotic patient the symptoms are often found to be the disguised expression of the sexual instinct, behind the delusions and hallucinations of the insane the sexual instinct is often detected subtly manipulating the wires.

It is disconcerting to find universal disagreement as to the meaning of the term instinct, and the significance of the word sexual. In discussing the sexual instinct, it will be wise at the beginning to lay little stress on the term instinct, which is merely an abstract from a complex whole. The term sexual is still more elusive. To associate it closely with reproduction would be to eliminate many reactions, where reproduction is out of the question, as in the homosexual manifestations; the adaptive or



biological criterion of reproduction does not suffice to denote what we call sexual.

There are certain activities we call sexual, as, for instance, masturbation at puberty. It is not so easy to qualify analogous manipulations in infancy. The casual gropings and manipulations of the child may involve the genitalia as well as the toes, but to apply the term sexual to the manipulations in the former case usually involves the assumption that there is a specific pleasure connected with the activity.

Of this specific pleasure there may however be indications only in a small proportion of cases. On the other hand, there may be evidence of this specific pleasure in relation to manipulations which are not directly connected with the genitalia, e. g., thumb-sucking. To assume that there *must* be this specific pleasure in thumb-sucking, and that this action is always of sexual character, is to make an unwarranted generalization. The emptying of the bladder or rectum yields a definite relief or pleasure, yet there seems to be no special basis for calling these activities or the pleasure sexual. In some cases, however, one finds a very close relationship between the pleasure associated with these acts and the pleasure associated with a definite condition of the sexual organs.

The extension of the term sexual to embrace a great variety of activities, merely because a certain pleasure is associated with these activities, appears to be unwarranted.

In another direction we see an equally unwarranted extension of the term; this time the emphasis is laid not on the hedonistic but on the energetic aspect of sexual activities. In this second formulation, not only are the generally accepted sexual activities grouped under the term sexual, but many activities which *prima facie* have no sexual quality whatever. It is assumed that there is a fixed quantum of a specific sexual energy, and if this does not have a direct outlet, it of necessity has an indirect expression, and all activities resulting from the repression of the specific sexual energy are *ipso facto* sexual.

Here we have the assumption of a specific sexual energy, often called "libido." Libido is like the chameleon; its true color is not easy to determine. It sometimes flaunts its sexual nature, again it prudently denies it, claiming only to be a generalized interest, or it may even claim to be the equivalent of the *élan vital*.

It is not easy to operate with such a concept, which at one time seems to represent the hunt for sexual pleasure, and again to be merely a focal manifestation of cosmic force. To assume that where a specific sexual activity is repressed, the alternative



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

activities must necessarily be sexual, is not sound. It is true that in many cases where sexual activity may be definitely modified by the repressed factor, and that its control of the reactive mechanisms of the individual may be only partial, often shows traces of compromise, and in some cases is only a disguised expression of the apparently repressed trend. In other cases, however, it may utilize all the energy of the individual, with complete, if temporary, abeyance of any sexual activity. We should be less schematic and dogmatic in formulating the facts of human behavior, which are related to the sexual life.

We are far from understanding in detail the constitutional and environmental influences which determine the rôle played by the sexual factors in the life of the child, and of the adult. In one child unequivocal sexual manifestations appear at a very early age, the child seems early sensitized to stimuli of this order and soon begins to accumulate experiences which load its later character; in another child the same stimuli may cause little response, and the sexual life only manifests itself much later and in a less disturbing fashion. We are not entitled to take the more sensitive and precocious child as the type and to assume that in the other child there has been the same evolution, repressed or disguised. Affection and emotional dependence on relatives and friends are attitudes much too complex to be expressed in simple sexual terms; they contain important factors which are not necessarily disguised or modified expressions of sexual forces. In different individuals the hedonic and the energetic aspects of the sex life vary considerably; it is not only a question of plus or minus, of repression or expression, of sublimation or vicarious indulgence. The mode in which the individual meets the tests of life, deals with the endogenous demands of his cravings, with the situations which occur during puberty, adolescence and adult life, whether celibate or married, is a function not merely of one single system but of the total personality. There is perhaps no better test of the general stability of the individual than the demands associated with the sex life; in analyzing the successes and failures in regard to this adaptation there is a danger of abstraction and simplification, and of over-emphasis on what is merely one component in the complex forces which make up the total personality.

---

## INFANTILE SEXUALITY

J. K. Friedjung (*Zeitschrift für Kinderheilkunde*, vol. 31, p. 1-15) deprecates the lack of interest in the psychic life of the



child shown by the majority of physicians as well as adults in general. They therefore are ignorant and helpless when confronted by important problems. This attitude is largely due to the disregard for one's own childhood's experiences. The ascetic ideal, rooted in wrong religious views and being unattainable to the majority of adults, prompts the desire in them to see sexual innocence realized in the child—"in our child."

In the literature this attitude is expressed by the assumption that childhood is "asexual," or "presexual." And yet everybody ought to know that the tremendous changes observed during puberty can not arise out of nothing. Such manifestations must be the result of a gradual development, the germs of which were existent in the past. Also in its psychic aspects, puberty points to a transformation brought about by biochemical (endocrine) influences.

The usual conception of sex is too narrow. If by sex manifestations we understand only those emotional impulses which aim at the sexual union with a partner belonging to the other sex, then of course, we could speak of the child's life being devoid of all sexual elements. But by doing this many aspects in the behavior of the child and the phenomena of puberty would be incomprehensible and we would shut the door to an understanding of all so-called perversions or inversions observed in the field of the sexual life. For instance, masturbation which is of such frequent occurrence in childhood, though not being mutual and devoid of any phantasies directed towards any individual belonging to the other sex, is a fact which can hardly be disputed.

The writer's discussion is based on a large material collected during a period covering more than ten years and embracing types of erotic manifestations observed in normal children. He presents examples of three types, namely, pleasureable sensations connected with the child's own person (autoerotism); with the person of another (heteroerotism); and those sought in the psychosexual sphere. The first type embraces pleasurable sensations felt by the child in sucking the breast. Some infants suck their finger even a few minutes after birth. In the writer's opinion, the child does not suck the breast because it wants food, but it gets the milk—as he puts it—"as an unexpected by-effect of the pleasurable sensations obtained from the sucking movements." This explains, the writer opines, why the infant takes the breast even if it is not hungry. In agreement with Freud, he considers the mouth as one of the erogenous zones, and recalls



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

a case of thumb-sucking continued into adult life and leading to the wrecking of a marriage. The erotic sensations derived from rhythmic movements, such as rocking, etc., belong to the same category, as also those connected with defecation and urination. The urethra is another erogenous zone, and many cases of enuresis are traceable to this source. [An assertion the truth of which I beg leave to deny. W. J. R.]. As to the second, the heteroerotic group, the writer gives numerous examples, such as the case of a boy, 3½ years old, who had erections when taken to bed with his mother; a girl of two years, when taken into her father's bed, hugs and kisses him, and then urinates. [Erections in children are often mechanical, and urination as a proof of eroticism is devoid of any foundation. W. J. R.]

Concerning the psychosexual behavior of children, the writer cites a number of instances of the "Oedipus Complex," and also examples of very young children craving to learn where babies come from.

Physicians are constantly asked for advice in this field, and if speaking from experience and unprejudiced observation, they will be able to indicate the directions to be taken and avert dangers.

---

## CHILDLESS MARRIAGES AND THE WAR

A. Mayer (*Klinische Wochenschrift*, 1922, I, 23) invites attention to the increase of sterile marriages noted since the end of the war. No somatic reason, not even gonorrhea, can be adduced for the explanation of this startling phenomenon, which in the writer's opinion has been brought about by "modifications of the *vita sexualis*." For instance the long engagement with the concomitant enforced continence, on the one hand, and the following sexual excesses of the newly wed couples, on the other hand, appear to produce mechanical as well as toxic injuries to which is to be attributed this sterility, or, in some instances, apparent sterility due to early miscarriages. Also a certain inner estrangement, which has developed owing to the long separation between engaged and married couples during the war, may have disturbed or even completely destroyed that sexual harmony, which though not being a *conditio sine qua non* of conception, nevertheless facilitates and promotes fecundation. In this sense we may also explain the increase in female frigidity as contributing its share to the prevalent sterility. Moreover, since the end of the war, many married men, owing to the exacerbated struggle



for existence, evidently find no more time "to engage in those exploratory expeditions to the erogenous zones of their wives which are of such an importance for the sexual harmony of married life." [I will say plainly that I take no stock whatever in a suddenly developed frigidity, inner estrangements, etc. The "sterility" is to be explained much more simply: the use of pre-ventives is becoming universal: That's all there is to it. W. J. R.].

---

### MALE AND FEMALE SEXUALITY

In these days, when so much greater liberty is accorded to boys and girls than was given in the past, the friends of liberty should insist with obstinacy on the need for knowledge. For if liberty is unaccompanied and unguided by knowledge, its degeneration into license will be triumphantly used by the lovers of bondage as an argument against liberty itself. Let me then say boldly that I am all for liberty. I want boys and girls, men and women, to see far more of each other and get to know each other much better than in the past. I believe in co-education, and in *real* co-education—not the sham that is practised in some of our universities and colleges. I see the risks and I want to take them. I know there will be "disasters," and I think them much less disastrous than those attending the methods of obscurantism and restraint. I think the idea that a boy and girl may not touch each other introduces a silly atmosphere of unreal "romance" where commonplace friendship is what is wanted. But with all this, and *because* of all this, I want a girl to know that a boy's body and mind are not *exactly* like hers; and perhaps a boy to know that a girl's is not totally *unlike* his!

In what way do they differ? The male, I think, is more liable to sudden gusts of passion, of violence so great as to be almost uncontrollable—at least so nearly as to make it both cruel and stupid to arouse them. A woman's nature is not (generally) so quickly stirred. She takes longer to move (hence the universal fact of courtship). Or rather it might be more accurate to say that he and she may both start at the same time from the same point, but she takes longer to reach the end, and because this is so, is more capable of stopping before the end is reached. This she does not understand, and expects that if *she* can pause, so can *he*: while he also misunderstands, and does not know that there is for her, just as much as for him, a moment when self-control becomes impossible.

*Sex and Common-Sense.. By A. Maude Royden.*



## THE ODIUM OF SEXUAL INVERSION

Inversion has always been looked upon as the gravest of all sexual offences and even at times when popular judgment was charitable about other irregularities it preserved the utmost rigor towards inversion. In speaking of the severe penalties which are inflicted by the Romans upon the transgressors, Gibbon states: "The adulterers were spared by the common sympathy of mankind; but the lovers of their own sex were pursued by general and pious indignation."

The excess of severity customary in imperial Rome is summed up by Gibbon as follows: "Justinian relaxed the punishment at least of female infidelity; the guilty spouse was condemned only to solitude and penance, and at the end of two years she might be recalled to the arms of a forgiving husband. But the same Emperor declared himself the implacable enemy of unmanly lust, and the cruelty of his persecution can scarcely be excused by the purity of his motives. In defiance of every principle of justice he stretched to past as well as to future offences the operations of his edicts. . . . A painful death was inflicted by the amputation of the sinful instrument, or the insertion of sharp reeds into the pores and tubes of most exquisite sensibility."

One of the consequences of this overemphasis was that inversion loomed before the public conscience as quite the most horrible accusation which could be brought against any one. An unfortunate individual, once accused of this crime, found himself immediately ostracised by his friends and no one dared to come to that person's aid, so that the slightest evidence was often enough to blast an innocent life. Gibbon observes: "A sentence of death and infamy was often founded on the slight and suspicious evidence of a child or a servant: the guilt of the green faction, of the rich, and of Theodora, was presumed by the judges, and paederasty became the crime of those to whom no crime could be imputed." This accusation, in the course of centuries, became a weapon in the hands of the unscrupulous for the vanquishing of religious and political rivals and for personal revenge.

---

## SEXUAL CHIVALRY

I have said so much about the lack of chivalry shown by women to men that it is only reasonable to point out that the reverse is true, and that men are often extraordinarily unchivalrous towards women. The cause is, of course, the same: they do not realize what a strain they are putting on them. There is still a very general assumption, even by those who really know better, that



women have no passions and are untempted from within. I have often been assured by "men of the world" that "a woman can always stop a man if she wants to." No doubt she can—some men. She can "stop them if she wants to." The trouble is that a time comes when she cannot want to. The bland assumption that a man has a perfect right to play on a woman's sex-instincts till they are beyond control, is based on the age-old determination not to recognize the full humanity of women. They are "different" from men. So they are. I have admitted it. But the likeness is much greater than the difference. And neither the likeness nor the difference makes self-control an easy thing for her. It is easier up to a certain point, because she is more slowly moved; it is harder when that point is reached because her whole nature is involved. She has never learned to say that she can give her body to one while remaining spiritually faithful to another, and perhaps she never will learn. I at least suspect so. She may be as fickle as a man, but it will be in a different way.

—*A. Maude Royden.*

---

## PROBLEMS INVOLVED IN THE CONGRESS OF THE SEXES

Arthur Thompson (Brit. M. J., Jan. 7, 1922) suggests that the function of the mucous membrane of the uterus is more likely to be absorbent than secretive, and that as such it plays an important part in the animal economy. The male ejaculate is composed of an admixture of the secretions of certain glands. These comprise the testes, the vesiculæ seminales, the prostate and Cowper's gland. In the female there is nothing comparable to the secretions discharged by those important glands in the male. In many mammals both prostate and vesicular glands are present, but in some—for example the dog and the cat—the prostate alone is represented. This seems to suggest that in some cases, nature can dispense with the secretion of the vesicular glands without detriment to the performance of the sexual function, whilst the more frequent combination of the two glands (prostatic and vesicular) seems to point to the advantage of their combined secretions in other instances. As to the function of the prostate, our knowledge is of the scantiest.

In regard to the manner in which the secretion is retained within the prostate, it has been explained that the secretion is stored in those parts of the gland lumina which are nearest the urethra, and consequently these collections are expelled during the sexual act by the contraction which begins at the distal end



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

of the non-striped muscular sheath which surrounds each tubule in its whole length. To these functions of the prostatic secretion must be added the observation that the increase in bulk of the ejaculate thus affected will mechanically facilitate the action of the muscles concerned in its expulsion.

In his sexual relations man is not controlled by such seasonal conditions as regulate the congress of the sexes in other animals. It happens frequently, therefore, that sexual union may occur when no ova are present to be fertilized.

Is any change effected in the female by the act of insemination apart from the specific act of fertilization? It is within our knowledge that marriage has resulted in greatly improved health in the case of women who, prior to their indulgence in normal sexual intercourse, were of sickly habit and imperfect physique, and this without pregnancy intervening.

That such change occurs at the first act of sexual congress is an old-standing belief. According to an old custom, which still survives in the South of France, a thread was measured round the neck of the bride before night; if next morning her neck had not become large enough to prevent the thread from reaching right around, it was thought a sure sign that the marriage had not been properly consummated.

What is the significance of this custom? It is well known that the thyroid gland is intimately associated with the sexual system, and that it responds, by increase in size, to pregnancy, and in some cases undergoes periodic enlargement corresponding to the menstrual cycle. That it often increases in size at the onset of puberty is common knowledge, but the ancient custom suggests that the change involved in the increase of the size of the thyroid—for it is this that leads to the increase in the diameter of the neck—is rapidly and apparently directly induced by the first insemination.

This proves that the ejaculate contains other ingredients than those alone concerned with fertilization. There may be some endocrine secretion which by rapid absorption thru the tissues of the female sets agoing, thru the agency of the thyroid, the complex mechanism involved in the elaborate preparations of the sexual system to meet its reproductive obligations. "The sexual act and marriage in both sexes increase the gland's activity, and it is known to swell in consequence, a fact well known to primitive races" (Mc Carrigon: "The Thyroid Gland." London 1917, p. 28).

Sir W. Arbuthnot Lane (Guy's Hosp. Gaz., xxxii. 1918, p. 384) makes many suggestive observations regarding the disabilities and



compensations entailed by the reproductive function in the female. As to the part played by the thyroid gland, he notes how its enlargement is accentuated by intercourse and by pregnancy, and expresses the opinion that it alters with the sexual appetite. He regards the prostate as possessed of a double function—an internal, the effect of which on the man is to act as a powerful stimulant; an external, the action of which on the woman is very far-reaching in its results. He recites his experience in cases of chronic intestinal stasis in the female, to the effect that frequently the condition is associated with breasts which he describes as “hard and knobby.” If, he says, the prostatic secretion is in sufficient quantity, the hardness does not develop, or if it already exists, it will subside or disappear altogether. Thomson has been told that amongst musicians it is recognized that the female voice never attains to its full pitch of excellence until marital relations have been established.

---

#### MARITAL RAPE

You can bargain for the possession of a violin and the moment it is yours, may play upon it. It is yours. If you are in the mood to play, it must be ready for you. If it is not, then tune it, and it will be. But a human being cannot be treated so in any human relationship. It needs mutual patience and mutual respect to make a relationship human.

This simple fact, however, has been so little understood of lovers, that husbands have, in genuine ignorance of the cruelty they were committing, raped their wives on their wedding night. Judging by what one knows of wedding-days, it could hardly be supposed that there could be a more unpropitious moment for the consummation of marriage. And when to the fatigue and strain of the day is added—as is still quite often the case—blank though uneasy ignorance as to what marriage involves, or the thunderbolt of knowledge (*sic*) launched by the bride’s mother the night before, or the morning of the day itself, it would be difficult with the utmost deliberation and skill better to ensure absolute repulsion and horror on the part of the bride. I think that any man who would consider this from the bride’s point of view would see that she need not necessarily be cold or unresponsive because, in such circumstances, she needs rest and consideration more than passion. But I wish men could know a little more than this, and understand that to enforce physical union when a woman’s psychical and emotional nature does not desire it, is definitely and physically cruel. Woman is not a passive instrument, and to treat her as such is to injure her.—*Sex and Common-Sense*. By A. Maude Royden.



## CONSANGUINEOUS AND MIXED MARRIAGES

Dr. Max Marcuse (*Zeitschrift für Sexualwissenschaft*, July, 1922) has added a new chapter to the much mooted question as to the genetic value of consanguineous and mixed marriages. He maintains that neither historical, sociological nor anthropological considerations warrant an *a priori* conclusion as to a deteriorative influence of either inbreeding *per se*, or cross-breeding *per se*, for on the one hand all mankind is the product of inbreeding, and on the other, all existing civilized nations represent a mixture of various races. Furthermore, we see that continued close inbreeding as well as reckless cross-breeding may be followed by the degeneration and death of families and peoples.

The biological evaluation of consanguineous as well as mixed marriages may be based on the following data: continued inbreeding produces a diminution of the size and a decrease in the fecundity of animals—and yet, breeders ascribe their best results to inbreeding. Amongst human beings, the offspring of consanguineous unions present an accumulation of diseases and deformities. The degeneration and dying-out of many aristocratic families, the racial pathology of the Jews, and the endemic constitutional inferiority observed amongst mountaineers who constantly intermarry, seem to demonstrate the dangers engendered by consanguineous marriages. But on the other hand, we observe good health in certain rural districts where inbreeding is the rule, and many aristocratic families in whom consanguineous marriages are in vogue, are distinguished by a remarkable biological superiority—this is especially to be seen in England. *Talented* individuals spring frequently from families in which consanguineous marriages are in vogue, while the *genius* is usually the product of the union of two individuals descended from different inbred stocks. In consanguineous as well as in mixed marriages, paucity of children is the rule and childlessness frequent, while again, in many instances such unions may prove very prolific.

How are we to reconcile these contradictions? The author points out that wherever consanguinity or racial differences in the parents seem to be responsible for deterioration in the quality and numerical decrease in the offspring, there are always other circumstances demonstrable which either by themselves produce the unfavorable results or, at least, are operative as associated factors. Likewise, a super proportionate prolificness may be traceable to other and more complicated concurrences. Not one single case has ever been observed, of either a consanguineous or mixed marriage, in which



the effects were determined solely by this biological factor, but either type is, like any marriage, a union between two persons, having its peculiar structure and not occurring a second time with the same congruence of all the internal and external conditions. Consequently, we are never dealing with the effects of inbreeding *per se* or cross-breeding *per se* exclusively, but always with a combination of other causative and determining factors. This will become clear if we take into consideration the different motives leading to consanguineous or mixed marriages, namely (1) lack of selection; (2) economic interests; (3) psychic (erotic) tendencies. According to the particular motive, marriages differ in character and, consequently, in their genetic value. The unprolificness of the consanguineous as well as of the mixed marriages is unmistakably influenced by the particular motives leading to the selection of the partner. We see that rationalizing and individualizing types are always distinguished by misoprogenitive tendencies. On the other hand, reckless yielding to instantaneous sexual passion, or selfish calculative reasoning is certainly prejudicial to the quality of the progeny. This consideration sheds light on the extraordinary significance of the personal element for the question as to the biologic effects of consanguineous and mixed marriages.

If we try to eliminate all erroneous conceptions, which are liable to obscure the problem of consanguineous and mixed marriages, we find that there seem to be no specific biological factors at work and that the results of such unions can be explained by the general laws of heredity which, in the main, are the laws discovered and formulated by Gregor Mendel. Considering the striking frequency and severity of diseases and deformities found in the children of blood relatives, we must bear in mind that inbreeding promotes the cropping out of latent parental predispositions in the progeny. "A hereditary taint with recessive hereditary diseases is latent in many families without the members of the families knowing anything about it. In extra-familial marriages there is no homozygous manifestation of the hereditary pathologic predisposition, while intrafamilial breeding favors its manifestation." (E. Baur). Or, as Marcuse expresses it, the genetic value of Sexual unions between blood relations is determined by the hereditary constitution of the family. Wherever we have a sound germ-plasm marriages amongst near kin will not prove deleterious to the progeny, on the contrary, they may exercise a favorable influence, owing to the fact that there are also *valuable* hereditary predispositions, which may lie dormant in



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

each parent and which by their concurrence will become manifest in the children. Or, the result may mean a strengthening of the constitutional parental qualities, which would become attended through intermixture with non-related individuals in whom those inheritable constitutional peculiarities are lacking. *There are absolutely no data available which would justify the assumption of any deteriorative effects due to inbreeding as such.*

For practical purposes, the question of the marriage between relatives should be decided on the ground of constitutional and hereditary biological considerations, that is to say, in each individual case the state of health of the respective families should be submitted to a careful examination. In cases of inheritable diseases or pathologic conditions we have to differentiate between those that are dominant and those that are recessive. In the case of dominance, individuals not themselves affected are, irrespective of the most severe familial taint, without any danger for the descendants. But if the familial disease is of the recessive type, consanguinity, even of healthy parents, will exercise an injurious effect upon the children through homozygosis. Owing to the fact that recessive hereditary diseases, which may not be manifest in the individual, are of extraordinary frequency, they are always open to suspicion from a eugenic point of view. Moreover, the propensity to forming consanguineous unions may often suggest a psychopathic predisposition. ("Neurotic endogamy." K. Abraham). Nevertheless, such unions should not be *a priori* discouraged, because through them there may also take place a homozygosis of *desirable* qualities.

In the heredo-biological results of mixed marriages, the operation of Mendel's laws is quite apparent: The splitting up of the gene and the free combination of the gene, that is to say, new races can never spring from the mixing of blood alone, the determining factors being selection and elimination. Moreover, in heredity there is no preponderance of one single race, only the individual traits being transmitted (dominant or recessive), so that the prevailing idea of "inferior" races getting the upper hand in crosses, is to be relegated to the limbo of popular fallacies. Recent investigations regarding the heredo-biological significance of miscegenation (the most important of them refers to the bastards of Rehobot—E. Fischer), seem to point to the exclusion of any deteriorative effects resulting from such mixtures. In this connection, attention is to be called to the difference between "organic" and "traditional" inheritance as being of great moment in mixed



marriages, which as a rule, are not only influenced by unusual personal but also by anomalous social relations.

Regarding the question as to the quantitative aspect of the genetic value of consanguineous and mixed marriages, the author re-emphasizes that both represent nothing specific, but—being usually based on the will to have but a few or no children at all—they correspond to the peculiarity of all rationalizing and individualizing types of marital unions. To this may be added that (1) regarding consanguineous marriages, some investigators maintain that “long continued and close inbreeding, even where the germ-plasma is faultless, engenders a decrease of vitality and fecundity in the progeny” (Gruber and Rudin). Older investigators found the cause for this phenomenon in a too pronounced similarity between the germ-plasms to which may be due a diminution of bionergy (Darwin, Spencer); in the light of the modern heredo-physiological conception this would mean that owing to insufficient supplementary activity of the chromosomes of one germplasm, the prerequisites for a favorable functioning of the hormones are weakened or destroyed through those of the other germplasm, and in such a case infecundity will be the result. As regards mixed marriages, it has been maintained that the dying-out of certain primitive peoples was due to excessive crossing with persons of the white races (Fehlinger), and that in such cases the chromosomes were too dissimilar to permit of a fusion, or, if the formation of a new organism was achieved, the germ-plasms were too disharmonious to be capable of procreation.

To this the author remarks: The assumption of marriages between persons belonging to different races being under the influence of a “germ-disparity” (“Keimfeindlichkeit”) which may be so intense as to produce immediate infecundity, or, at least sterility in the issue resulting from such unions, has never been demonstrated and appears to be highly improbable if applied to the species *homo sapiens*.

In conclusion, Marcuse admits that by the employment of merely scientific investigations we shall succeed in only ascertaining the material conditions of procreation and heredity, but we shall never be able to grasp the inmost nature of these processes, and with all the physical, chemical, mechanical, cytologic and serologic methods at our command, in short, with all the means of the empiric and exact sciences, we shall never succeed in even coming near to the real problem, namely, to understand the generative transmission of organic forms and teleologic capabilities.

Thus the modern science of heredity, which is founded on



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

the ingenious experiments and investigations of Gregor Mendel, can answer the question as to the genetic value of consanguineous and mixed marriages only in relation to its material contents—its metaphysical phase lying beyond all external experience.

---

Surely people who propose to spend their lives together ought to know (for example) whether children are desired and whether many or few; and what the attitude of either is on the vexed subject of birth control. Imagine the case of a husband who thinks the use of contraceptives right and wishes to use them; and a wife who thinks them absolutely wrong and, being warned by the doctor that she must not have more children, cheerfully, and with perfect conviction that she is acting nobly, invites her husband to run the risk of causing her death! Yet I have known such cases.—*A. Maude Royden.*

---

## INBREEDING AND MISCEGENATION.

In his book on "Nobility" (Leipzig, 1922), Count R. N. Coudenhove takes up the subject of inbreeding and cross-breeding. The author, who on the paternal side springs from the nobility of Northern Brabant and who from his maternal ancestors has inherited various strains of blood, bases his argument not on scientific investigations but on his own inner experiences. The value of his essay consists in an intuitive conception and an artistic representation of the subject.

"As a rule, the rustic is the product of inbreeding, while the city dweller represents a mixed breed." Parents and ancestors of the peasant hail from the same thinly populated district; the parents and ancestors of the nobleman come from the same thin upper crust. In both cases the ancestors are closely related by the ties of blood and therefore present physical, psychical and spiritual similarities. Their peculiar traits, volitional tendencies, passions, prejudices and inhibitions are in an exaggerated degree transmitted to their descendants. Their essential characteristics, resulting from inbreeding, are loyalty, piety, love of family, spirit of caste, constancy, obstinacy, energy, narrowness, predominance of prejudices, lack of objectivity, a limited mental horizon. Here one generation is not a variation but a duplicate of the preceding generation, and instead of development we have conservation. In the large cities congregate people of different nationalities, races, classes. As a rule, the inhabitants of a metropolis are *sujets mixtes*, composed of the most divergent social and ethnic elements in whom the characteristics,



prejudices, inhibitions, volitional tendencies and views of the parents and ancestors are undergoing a process of obliteration or at least attenuation. In these hybridized individuals we find characterlessness, lack of inhibitions, want of will-power, inconstancy and frivolity blended with objectivity, versatility, intellectual alertness, broadmindedness and freedom from prejudices. Mixed breeds always differ from their parents and ancestors, each generation being a variation of the preceding one, either in the sense of evolution or degeneration. The product of inbreeding is a man with one soul, while the descendant of different stocks has many souls. The ancestors of each individual continue to live in him as components of his soul, and, if they be homogeneous, the soul will be uniform, stable; if they be divergent the soul will be multiform, complicated, differentiated.

The greatness of a mind lies in its extensity, that is to say, in its capacity to grasp and embrace everything; the greatness of a character exhibits itself in its intensity, that is to say, in a strong, concentrated, persistent will. Thus, in a certain sense, wisdom and energy are antagonistic. The more pronounced an individual's ability and proclivity to be a sage and to look at things from every angle and without prejudice, the weaker are his volitional impulses and the less capable he will be to follow unflinchingly a certain line of action; for each motive is opposed by a counter—motive, faith by skepticism, each act by the recognition of its comic meaninglessness. Only the narrow-minded, the one-sided man can be energetic. But there is not only an unconscious, naive narrowness, there is also a conscious, heroic narrowness. The heroic narrow-minded person—and to this type belong all truly great men of action—may at times voluntarily delete all the features of his nature save one, namely, that which determined his actions. Before he acts, or after, he may be objectivistic, critical, skeptical, but during the execution he will always be subjectivistic, loyal, one-sided, unjust. Wisdom fetters energy, while energy disowns wisdom. The strongest will without self-direction is powerless; but even a weak will which moves in one direction, may accomplish great things. No life of action without injustice, error, guilt; whosoever is deterred by this odium would better take refuge in the realm of thought, meditation, inactivity. Truthful men are always taciturn, for every assertion is in a certain sense a prevarication; the pure in heart are always inactive, for every act is in a certain sense a tort. But it is always more manly to talk, even at the peril of telling a lie; it is always more courageous to act, even at



## ABSTRACTS AND TRANSLATIONS

the peril of committing an injustice. Inbreeding strengthens the character and debilitates the mind, while cross-breeding debilitates the character and invigorates the mind. Whenever inbreeding and cross-breeding concur under an auspicious constellation, there will come forth a superior human type in which the strongest character is blended with the most acute mind. Inbreeding and cross-breeding concurring under inauspicious conditions will produce degenerate types with weak characters and dull minds. The man of the distant future will be a *sujet mixte*. The races and castes of today will succumb to man's conquest of time and prejudice. The Eurasian-Negroid race of the future, externally resembling the ancient Egyptians, will replace the diversity of nationalities by the variety of personalities. For, according to the laws of heredity, the uniformity of the progeny increases with the variability of the progenitors. The children of inbred families resemble one another, all representing the uniform, common family type. In cross-bred families the children are more differentiated, each representing a new variation of divergent parental and ancestral elements. Inbreeding produces characteristic types, while cross-breeding creates original individuals. In modern Europe the Russian, as a mixtum compositum of Slavic, Tataric and Finnish elements, is the precursor of the coming planetary man, for of all the European nations he represents the least of an homogeneous racial stock. The Russian, with his large, deep, rich, all-embracing soul, is the representative polypsychic anthropos. His most distant antipode is the insular Briton, the high-bred monopsychic anthropos, whose strength lies in his character, his will, his one-sidedness, his typicalness. To him modern Europe is indebted for the most complete, finished type—the gentleman.

---

## THE ETHICS OF BIRTH CONTROL

I do not enter into the question of birth control, because it has been and is being discussed much more freely than in the past, and by married people who are much better able to estimate the difficulties and advantages on either side of the question than any unmarried person can possibly be. Since, however, I am continually asked at least to give my personal opinion, for what it is worth, and since it is true that I have heard a good deal (on both sides) from those who *are* married, I will say briefly that it seems to me of supreme importance (1) that every child that is born should be *desired*, and (2) that no mother's time and strength should be so far overtaxed as to prevent her giving to each child *all the love and individual care that it requires*.—A. Maude Royden.



## Book Review

Dreams and the Unconscious. An introduction to the study of Psychoanalysis. By Prof. C. W. VALENTINE (University of Birmingham). New York: The MacMillan Co., 1922; Cc. 8vo., cloth, pp. 144; \$1.50.

Prof. Valentine's little book is really an introduction to the general theory of Freudian psycho-analysis rather than an exposition of Freud's theory of dreams, although the latter subject is of course not neglected. In its 140 pages, notwithstanding the large type and liberal margins—excellent qualities in a scientific book—the reader will find a simple, lucid, intelligible and just presentation of the essentials of the psycho-analytic theory.

But unlike more than nine-tenths of English books and essays and pamphlets on this now popular subject, the book is not merely a rehash of what we are all already too familiar with, of what has been said over and over again *ad nauseam*; it is a critical as well as a fair statement of the subject by a man who is more than a mere compiler of other men's work, a man who gives evidence of considerable scientific training and who is sufficiently free from the religious frame of mind to be able and to dare to think for himself. The Freudians will therefore not welcome this book with open arms. The fact is that Professor Valentine rejects so many of Freud's theories and offers so many really sound psychological objections and contributions to the subjects he discusses that the general impression left by the perusal of the book is that its author is so luke-warm a supporter of orthodox psycho-analysis that he is really not a Freudian at all but rather one of that group of English medical psychologists whom he designates as "neo-Freudians." A "neo-Freudian" he defines as one 'who rejects some of Freud's doctrines though he has been greatly influenced by certain of his main ideas.' When these neo-Freudians, including Professor Valentine, will come to realize that the Freudian "Unconscious" is a myth, scientific psychology will be freed from one of the greatest dangers that has been threatening it for the past decade, and psycho-therapeutics will be freed from one of the greatest obstacles to a rational and really health-giving technique. When that time comes these analysts will realize that what they have been calling the patient's resistances to getting cured was really a resistance against accepting theories and interpretations which were supremely arbitrary, wilful and mystical.

It was one of Professor Valentine's main purposes "to bring



## BOOK REVIEW

the main doctrines of Freudism into line with 'orthodox psychology,' but in this he has failed, necessarily so, because it is not true that these doctrines are only "unfamiliar examples of recognized fundamental laws of the mind." It will do psycho-analysis little good to say that so far as these doctrines are true they are not "entirely new." That was said long ago and it was supplemented with the equally true statement that what is new in psycho-analysis is not true. The fundamental fact on which the whole psycho-analytic theory is based, that on which it rests or falls, is the Unconscious. If Professor Valentine cannot establish this Unconscious all his labors in this direction are in vain. Unfortunately he refrains from discussing this important subject, although he admits that there is much about it that "remains a mystery."

The dangers of psycho-analysis in the treatment of neurotics are several times spoken of by the author, and justly so, but he nowhere has a word to say about the much more serious danger to scientific psychology and scientific method.

Again and again our author emphasizes the fact that Freud's deductions about sex and about dreams and repressions are true only of neurotics. We suspect that this is only an attempt to make psycho-analysis palatable for public consumption. Freud and his disciples will be sure to resent the inference that they have discovered and elaborated only a patho-psychology, if they deign to notice the book at all.

Professor Valentine singles out for special mention in his preface the main characteristics of his treatment of the subject, i. e., his contributions to it. We quote:

"I have connected the act of repression with the general tendency of the mind to show aversion from the unpleasant, distinguishing three kinds of repression: deliberate, non-deliberate but conscious, and unconscious. The first two come under the aversion principle; unconscious repression is regarded by me as a habit which has become automatic. Elimination by non-deliberate repression regarded as a similar phenomenon to the elimination of the unsuccessful in learning by the method of trial and error. Displacement of feeling and prolonged emotional word-reactions are treated as extreme cases of "short-circuited" associations. Symbolism in dreams is shown to be used at times in quite trivial ways, and so to be not always ascribable to any serious censorship. Repression of higher impulses, as well as of lower, is regarded by me as a possible cause of dreams. Incidentally, attention is called to the fact that Freud's main thesis as to dreams and the censorship is to be found in Plato's discussion of dreams."



The author several times speaks of "exhaustion of nervous energy" resulting from "repression," but he nowhere tells us why or how repression can cause such an "exhaustion."

The author suggests (p. 33) that repression, forgetting, is a sort of habit of turning from the unpleasant *qua* unpleasant. But this is certainly not the repression that Freud speaks of. The Freudian repression is an intensely active process or group of processes (forcible expulsion from consciousness, attraction from the Unconscious, etc.) in no way comparable to the mere withdrawal of the attention which is implied in Professor Valentine's description. If repression is such an inactive process we do not see how it can possibly cause the exhaustion of nervous energies spoken of on page 34.

Discussing the relationship between repression and the occurrence of neurosis, Valentine correctly says: "We have no absolute proof that the actual repression was the cause of the original trouble;" but we would go further and omit the word "absolute." He follows this with the very just and sensible assertion that "the forgetting [!] might have been an accompaniment [not the cause] of the development of the disease."

In attempting to defend his theory that repression is a kind of learning by the method of trial and elimination of error, Valentine commits an error which is characteristic of all psycho-analysts. He speaks (p. 40) of a person learning to play golf and learning to avoid the repetition of useless strokes, and says that "this inhibition of the unsuccessful action—which we may also call a repression—is usually quite unintentional if not unconscious." Now, this is certainly not repression and there is no scientific warrant in calling it so. Besides, the attempt to eliminate undesirable movements when one is learning to play golf or to play the violin is certainly neither "unintentional" nor "unconscious." The trouble with all psycho-analysts is that they are too ready to assume the absence of consciousness; even a little self-observation and insistent questioning of their patients would give them abundant proof that many things which they assume to be unconscious are really conscious.

We are disposed to find fault with Professor Valentine for not giving any credit to Dr. Joseph Breuer for his discovery that the revival of lost memories cures certain nervous maladies. Our author gives his readers the erroneous impression (p. 43) that this was Freud's discovery. The matter is of the utmost importance from a historical as well as from a moralistic point of view, especially when it is considered that ultimately all the superstructure that Freud has built on Breuer's foundation will



## BOOK REVIEW

have to be torn down and we shall have to begin to build again where Breuer left off.

Professor Valentine is anything but orthodox when he maintains that repression is not the sole cause for the forgetting of dreams (p. 53), that "many dreams" are of "no great significance as a clue to repressions" (p. 54), that "suggestion plays an important part in many cures" (p. 71), that the partial impulses (sadism, masochism, anal eroticism, etc.) do not attain "any great strength in the majority of children" (p. 76), that various impulses which may become intimately associated with sex are not in any real sense sexual in their early appearance (p. 76), that it is not necessary to stress the significance of sex in early childhood, that not all dreams are the disguised fulfilment of repressed wishes (p. 90), that there is no "adequate evidence that dreams have any biological function of appreciable importance" (p. 114) and that many dreams may be of no real significance.

Chapter VIII, dealing with "Sublimation and Sex," is worth the price of the book. The author makes it quite clear and proves that "so far we have no proof of sublimation, in the strict sense, of the sex instinct through art or religion." The sexual instinct can be satisfied only by sexual indulgence; the attempt to elude this instinct will inevitably, sooner or later, the length of time depending wholly on the individual constitution, result in disaster.

The advice to sublimate, so easily given to neurotics by psychoanalysts who do not sublimate, is, in almost all instances, the merest hypocrisy.

The following quotation speaks for itself: "Freud's interpretation of fear-dreams as the expression of anxieties connected with sex impulses had already, on general grounds, seemed to me most unsatisfactory, and it appears still more inadequate, in view of the appearance of so many fear-dreams at a very early age and at a period when Freud himself holds that dreams are interpretable on the basis of their manifest content."

There is much more in this excellent little book that we would like to quote but the reader will do better to buy it and study it in detail.

S. A. T.

---

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All books received will be acknowledged or briefly described in these pages. This acknowledgment or description will be considered by us a full equivalent to the publishers for the courtesy of sending us the books. Books which we consider of special interest will, however, be reviewed, some of them quite exhaustively.

**Psychoanalysis and the Drama.** By S. E. Jelliffe, M. D., and Louise Brink, A. B., Washington and New York: Nervous and Mental Dis-



## JOURNAL OF SEXOLOGY AND PSYCHANALYSIS

ease Pub. Co., 1922; large 8 vo., wrappers, pp. V-12; \$3.00. (Consists of an Introduction and 10 Chapters in which the following eight plays are "analyzed": Magic, Eyes of Youth, Peter Ibbetson, Redemption, The Army with Banners, The Willow Tree, The Yellow Jacket, Dear Brutus, The Jest.

**The Contributions of the Various Countries to the Science of Psychology.** By Jas. Drever (Edinburgh University); in "Scientia", August, 1922. 32: 83-92.

**Come Funziona la Nostra Intelligenza.** (How our Mind Functions.) By Eug. Rignano. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli (1922); 8 vo., wrappers, pp. 46; L. 4. 50.

**A Psychoanalytic Study of Psychoses with Endocrines.** By D. W. Fay, Ph. D. New York and Washington: Nervous and Mental Disease Pub. Co., 1922; large 8 vo., wrappers; pp. 8-122; price not given. No index.

**Revista de Psiquiatria y Disciplinas Conexas.** Vol. 4, No. 1; Enero 1922; Lima, Peru. Contains the following essays:

1. La Obstetricia en el folklore peruano. (Obstetrics in Peruvian folklore.) By Drs. H. Valdizan and A. Maldonado;

2. La psiconeurosis climatica que se denomina 'nevada'. By Dr. E. Escomel;

3. The imperceptible obvious. By Paul Wilson. (A criticism of Freud's 'Aliquis' example.)

4. La negacion de la paternidad como sintoma psicosisico. By Dr. H. F. Delgado.

**Tertium Organum: A Key to the Enigmas of the World.** By P. D. Ouspensky; Translated from the Russian by N. Bessaraboff and C. Bragdon. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1922; large 8 vo., cloth, pp. 15-336; \$4.00 net. (Attempts to formulate a philosophy based upon the concept of the fourth dimension. Intuitionist, occultistic, mystical. Excellently translated.)

**Sexualreform und Sexualwissenschaft.** Stuttgart: J. Putmann, 1922; 8 Vo., paper, pp. 286. (36 papers on sexual reform and sexual science read at the international congress in Berlin. Issued by Dr. A. Weil in behalf of the Berlin Institute for Sexual Science. Thorough and well worth reading.)

**Knut Hamsun.** By H. A. Larsen. N. Y.: A. A. Knopf, 1922; Cr. 8 Vo., Cl., pp. 170; \$1.50.

**Fielding Sargent: A Novel.** By Elsa Barker. N. Y.: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1922; pp. 319; \$2.00. (Insufferably dull as a novel, and woefully inaccurate and misleading as an exposition of psychoanalysis.)

**Gedichte.** By Geo. S. Viereck. With an Introduction by Prof. Ed. Engel. Leipzig: Hesse & Becker; 1922, 12 mo., Cloth, pp. 176; \$1.50.

**Psychoanalysis and Love.** By André Tridon. New York, Brentano's, 1922, pp. 333, with Index. \$2.50.

**Psychoanalysis: Its Theories and Practical Application.** By A. A. Brill, M. D., Lecturer on Physicoanalysis and Abnormal Psychology, New York University. Philadelphia and London, W. B. Saunders Co., 1922. 3rd Edition, thoroughly revised; pp. 453. \$5.00.

**Psychology. The Science of Human Behavior.** By Robert Chenault Givler, Professor of Philosophy and Psychology, Tufts College. This volume is one of a new series which will be devoted to scientific subjects of interest to every one, treated in a clear and readable manner. 382 pp. Harper & Brothers. \$3.00.

**Signs of Sanity and The Principles of Mental Hygiene.** By Stewart Paton, M. D. Pp. 241, with Index. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1.50.

**The Psychology of Society.** By Morris Ginsberg, M. A., Lecturer in Philosophy, University College, London. Pp. 174, with Index. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co. \$2.50.

**Marriage and Efficiency.** By Carl Ramus, M. D. Pp. 239. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

[End of No. 2, Vol. 1, of The Journal of Sexology and Psychanalysis]